Vol. LXXVI, No. 4 April, 1927

The Ecclesiastical Review

Monthly Publication for the Clergy Cum Approbatione Superiorum

CONTENTS

"LE PETIT CAREME" OF MASSILLON 353
The Right Rev. Monsignor H. T. HENRY, Litt.D., Washington, D. C.
A THOUGHT FOR HOLY THURSDAY. 369
The Right Rev. ALEXANDER MacDONALD, D.D.
EASTER CAROLS AND CAROLING 373
The Rev. F. JOSEPH KELLY, Ph.D., Mus.D., Detroit, Michigan.
CALUMNY AND THE POPES. II Pius IX Exonerated 379
The Rev. HERBERT THURSTON, S.J., London, England.
PHYSICAL, SPIRITUAL, AND SPIRIT COGNITION 393
AUSTIN O'MALLEY, M.D., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
THE SACRIFICE OF THE NEW LAW 398
The Rev. JOSEPH BRODIE BROSNAN, Rochdale, England.
THE ARCHBISHOP'S POCKET-BOOK. XIX: Holy Poverty 413
FOR THE BETTER CATECHISM 430
EXPERIENCES WITH THE BALTIMORE CATECHISM 431
AN EX-SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS.
THE SUNDAY EPISTLES AND GOSPELS 436
PASTOR VILLANUS.
FORM OF EPISCOPAL CONSECRATION. 437
The Rev. MICHAEL D. FORREST, M.S.C., Natick, Rhode Island.
THE VEIL OF THE OSTENSORIUM 440
SACRISTA.
ORGANIZATIONS OF CATHOLIC LAYMEN 442
RUSTICUS.
AFFINITY AS A DIRIMENT IMPEDIMENT 446
THE CONTROVERSY ABOUT THE LAST SUPPER 450

TABLE OF CONTENTS CONTINUED INSIDE

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

PUBLISHED AT
113 E. Chestnut Street
Lancaster, Pa.

THE DOLPHIN PRESS
1305 Arch St., Philadelphia

GENERAL OFFICES
1305 Arch Street
Philadelphia, Pa.

Copyright, 1927: American Ecclesiastical Review—The Dolphin Press

Subscription Price: United States and Canada, $4.00—Foreign Postage, $1.00 additional

Sole Agents { Great Britain: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 8 Paternoster Row, London, E. C., 4
Ireland: Catholic Truth Society of Ireland, 24 Upper O'Connell St., Dublin
Australia: W. P. Linehan, 8 Bourke St., Melbourne

Entered, 2 July, 1924, as Second Class Matter, Post Office at Lancaster, Pa., under Act of 3 March, 1879

BROTHERHOOD CORPORATION

L. L. FARRELL (President)

Vineyards:

Washingtonville, Est. 1839
Livermore, California

Address all communications to:

New York Office
71 Barclay Street

Producers of the Finest Altar Wines in America

The Brotherhood is one ot the oldest and largest Altar wine houses in this country. We allow no dealers to handle our Altar wines, all shipments being made direct to the Reverend Clergy from our vineyards at Washingtonville, New York.

Mr. L. L. Farrell, the President, has devoted his entire life to the Altar wine industry, and all shipments are made under his personal supervision.

Requests for price lists and application blanks will have prompt attention

Altar Wine Supremacy

SINCE 1877

The COVICK Altar Wines are produced in California and are the only wines having the unqualified approval and commendation of all the Bishops of California.

✢ ✢ ✢

The Chancellor of the San Francisco Archdiocese supervises the making and distribution of the COVICK wines under the authority of His Grace the Most Reverend Archbishop.

The COVICK wines are not only valid and licit matter for the Holy Sacrifice; they are mature wines of the very highest grade and dependability.

✢ ✢ ✢

The COVICK altar wines, because of their rich mellow wholesome character are the ideal wines for the fasting priest and no wines anywhere in America are comparable with them.

✢ ✢ ✢

For the convenience of the Clergy throughout the country the COVICK Mass Wines may be obtained from

The T. F. Rodden Agency
25 Barclay Street
New York City, N. Y.

The I. Donnelly Company
408–410 East Ninth Street
Kansas City, Mo.

Fee Brothers
21–27 North Water Street
Rochester, N. Y.

William Moran Agency
873 Payne Avenue
St. Paul, Minn.

J. Redmond Covick
33 South Wells Street
Chicago, Ill.

Sievers Church Goods Co.
228 East Commerce Street
San Antonio, Texas

or direct from

The Covick Company, 330 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Cal.

The Covick Company

Established 1877 **Incorporated 1900**

CONTENTS CONTINUED

ANALECTA:

S. CONGREGATIO DE SEMINARIIS ET DE STUDIORUM UNIVERSITATIBUS: Epistola ad Rmos Ordinarios, de Catechetica Disciplina in Sacris Seminariis Impense Excolenda. 426

S. CONGREGATIO DE RELIGIOSIS: Congregatio Sororum Sanctae Mariae, Oregonopolitan., ejusque Constitutiones approbantur 429

DIARIUM ROMANAE CURIAE

List of Recent Pontifical Appointments. 429

STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:

Our Analecta—Roman Documents for the Month 430
For the Better Catechism 430
Experiences with the Baltimore Catechism. (*An Ex-Superintendent of Schools*) 431
Is Uniformity of Community Worship Undesirable? (*Non-Gazol.*) 436
The Sunday Epistles and Gospels. (*Pastor Villanus*) 436
Form of Episcopal Consecration. (*The Rev. Michael D. Forrest, M.S.C., Natick, Rhode Island*) 437
Loss of Blessing of the Alb 440
The Veil of the Ostensorium. (*Sacrista*) 440
Organizations of Catholic Laymen. (*Rusticus*) 442
Payment of Debt. (*R. Confessarius*) 444
Affinity as a Diriment Impediment 446
The Controversy about the Last Supper. (*Priestly Teacher*) 450
Latin Mass in Oriental Church 451
The Bishops' Pastoral Letter on the Mexican Situation. 451

CRITICISMS AND NOTES:

Christopher: S. Aureli Augustini Hipponiensis Episcopi de Catechizandis Rudibus Liber Unus 452
Mangan: Life, Character and Influence of Desiderius Erasmus 455
Berry: The Church of Christ 458
De Smet: De Sponsalibus et Matrimonio 459

LITERARY CHAT 460

BOOKS RECEIVED 463

ESSENTIALIA PHILOSOPHIAE

Quae in Usum Incipientium Digessit

FRANCISCUS P. SIEGFRIED

in Seminario S. Caroli Borromaei Philadelphiense Professor

Pocket Summary of Catholic Philosophy, giving the essentials of **Logic, Ontology, Cosmology, Psychology, Theodicy, Ethics,** briefly, clearly, in form of question and answer.

All set forth in graphic survey. For students of Philosophy in the Seminary and for maturer students who desire to make a rapid review of their Philosophy.

$1.80 a copy postpaid

American Ecclesiastical Review *Dolphin Press* 1305 Arch Street, Philadelphia

Firms with Episcopal Authorization to Handle Sacred Vessels to Repair Them

BALTIMORE:	JOHN MURPHY CO., Park Avenue and Clay Street.
BOSTON.	BIGELOW KENNARD & CO., 511 Washington Street. THOS. J. FLYNN & CO., 62-64 Essex Street. MATTHEW F. SHEEHAN COMPANY, 17 and 19 Beach St. PATRICK J. GILL, 387 Washington Street.
CHICAGO:	BENZIGER BROTHERS, 205-207 W. Washington Street. (Factories: Brooklyn, N. Y., and Bridgeport, Conn.) JOHN P. DALEIDEN CO., 1530-32 Sedgwick Street. ECCLESIASTICAL GOODS CO., 984 Milwaukee Ave. D. B. HANSEN & SONS, 27 N. Franklin Street. EDWARD J. KOENIG COMPANY, 819-823 Rush Street. SPAULDING & CO., Michigan Avenue and Van Buren St. HUBERT GOTZES, INC., 1536 North Clark Street.
CINCINNATI:	BENZIGER BROTHERS, 429 Main Street. (Factories: Brooklyn, N. Y., and Bridgeport, Conn.) FR. PUSTET CO., 436 Main Street.
DENVER:	JAMES CLARKE CHURCH GOODS HOUSE, 638-40 Tremont St
LOS ANGELES:	EDWARD J. KOENIG COMPANY, 1107 South Main Street.
MILWAUKEE:	BERGS MANUFACTURING CO., 483-485 Twenty-seventh Street DIEDERICH-SCHAEFER CO., 413 Broadway. A. WERNER, 649 E. Water Street.
NEW YORK:	BENZIGER BROTHERS, 36-38 Barclay Street. (Factories: Brooklyn, N. Y., and Bridgeport, Conn.) THE FEELEY CO., 10 W. 50th Street. THE GORHAM COMPANY, 5th Avenue and 47th Street. P. J. KENEDY & SONS, 44 Barclay Street. FR. PUSTET CO., 52 Barclay Street. RAMBUSCH DECORATING CO., 2 West 45th Street. THE C. WILDERMANN CO., 33 Barclay Street.
OMAHA:	KOLEY AND SON, 2910 Farnam Street.
PHILADELPHIA:	H. L. KILNER, & CO., 1708 Market Street. J. J. McDERMOTT, Room 818, 1011 Chestnut Street. F. C. PÉQUIGNOT, 1331 Walnut Street. FRANK QUIN & CO., 46 North 9th Street. HERMAN J. WOLF, 539-543 W. Huntingdon Street. WRIGHT MANUFACTURING CO., 127-35 Master Street.
PITTSBURGH: .	E. J. LETZKUS, 2006 Jenkins Arcade.
PROVIDENCE:	THE GORHAM COMPANY, Elmwood. W. J. SULLIVAN CO., 96 Jefferson Street. JOSEPH TALLY, 506-512 Westminster Street.
ST. LOUIS:	B. HERDER BOOK CO., 17 South Broadway. MUELLER PLATING CO., 920 Pine St., Imperial Bldg.
ST. PAUL:	THE E. M. LOHMANN CO., 385 St. Peter St.

THE
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

EIGHTH SERIES.—VOL. VI.—(LXXVI).—APRIL, 1927.—No. 4.

"LE PETIT CAREME" OF MASSILLON.

IN a previous paper (cf. the REVIEW for September, 1926, *Sermons to Children*) attention was called to the difficult feat achieved by Massillon in preaching, to a child of eight years, a whole Lenten course whose popular success was immediate, and whose burden of thought appeared to be fairly appreciated even by the young king himself.

"A child of eight years." The "eight" is of some importance here, since I have seen the age of the young Louis XV. placed variously at nine and ten years when he heard the Lenten course, and one writer on the subject of children's sermons, discussing the difficulty presented to a preacher by the varying mentalities of a youthful congregation, assigns the exact figure of eight as the average age whose maturity would permit the discourses addressed to it to be of sufficient interest for the appreciation of children ranging in age from six to twelve years. Now Louis was born on 15 February, 1710, and the first sermon of the Petit Carême was delivered in his presence on the feast of the Purification, 1718. He thus lacked, at that time, thirteen days of being eight years old.

I have thought it of sufficient interest to those who must preach to congregations of children to translate in full the first sermon of the Lenten course, and to do this with great literalness rather than with an attempt at rhetorical fluency, so that some idea may be had of the manner of preaching adopted by Massillon. He has been praised highly for his just pedagogical instinct, and perhaps may be considered as having set up an intelligible sign-post showing the road that preachers

might well follow in such an uncertain journeying. Some reserves should doubtless be made. The young king was perhaps precocious, and at all events had had excellent tutors in both civil and sacred science. The unamplified reference to Roboam would suggest that much Scriptural history was intelligently known to him.

The first authenticated edition of Massillon's sermons was published at Paris in 1745. The first volume of the edition (Paris, 1754) from which I translate, contains Le Petit Carême with a Preface giving a general appreciation of Massillon's pulpit oratory and including a special estimate of his Lenten course delivered before the young Prince, at the request of the Regent. The Preface calls attention to the fact that the little boy was then entered into the age when reason commences to develop, and that Massillon accordingly judged it opportune to preach for the behoof of the young King himself, in order to instruct him in the duties of royalty:

> But such a purpose demanded sermons entirely different from those which he had preached up to that time and which, in respect both of matter and style, were unsuited to a young prince of nine years. He therefore invented, so to speak, a new sort of eloquence. Style, instruction, everything was proportioned to the age of the young monarch. He gave to his style more vivacity, more harmony, more ornaments, and withal something of an academic flavor. The instructions, relieved of the dryness of reasoning, consisted of maxims on the duties of princes, expressed in a few words, but so presented as to make a lively impression on mind and heart. This style and this manner of instructing were something wholly new for Father Massillon; and, meanwhile, six weeks sufficed for the composition of these ten sermons, so admirable, so highly praised, which comprise in abridged form whatsoever could form a prince loved by God and men, and which were often interrupted either by the applause or by the tears of his august auditory.

Massillon himself declared that the sermons were "entretiens particuliers, faits pour l'instruction du Roi avant sa majorité, et pour les personnes de la cour qui composoient[1] seuls l'auditoire . . . ". It might seem a divided purpose—to instruct at one and the same time a child of eight years and

[1] The archaic spelling of the 1754 edition has been retained here, as also in the "Francois" of a subsequent quotation ("le Theatre Francois").

his assembled courtiers of adult age. Not only were the reasoning powers of these fully matured, but their passions had had time to develop, their temptations could be adequately recognized by them, the point and significance of Massillon's remarks could be appreciated. But the child of eight years? How could he at all assess the temptations of the great and powerful, or realize in any satisfactory fashion his opportunities to work immeasurable good or immeasurable evil?

The orator—and Oratorian—nevertheless declared that he addressed his efforts toward instructing the young King. Let us hear him.

If but a few of Massillon's thoughts could be appreciated by the young Louis, and if nevertheless the length of the sermons did not interfere with the boy's willingness to listen attentively throughout, perhaps we shall conclude that the orator's manner of delivery possessed a peculiar charm and made a deep impression on the souls of the hearers. I rather think that here, as in many cases elsewhere, the manner may have been of more value to a young listener than the excellent matter and the beautiful rhetoric clothing it. The Preface tells us something of Massillon's delivery:

> With respect to delivery ("*action*")—that part so essential to the orator—it was not at first because of this that Massillon was admired. He did not share the taste of the time. He could not endure to replace that natural manner which carries with it the sense of conviction, by an assumed air and a declamatory tone that made the ministers of Jesus Christ appear like men who mounted the pulpit to act a part, and that robbed their discourses of force and credence. It was therefore to be expected that the hearer, whose taste had been spoiled by the well-nigh universal style of declamation, should at first dislike the style of Father Massillon, which broke all the accepted rules of delivery. But as it became clear that he nevertheless made an extraordinary impression on the minds of his hearers, they gradually rid themselves of their prepossessions, and came to the just conclusion that his manner of speaking was good, and more than good, since no other preacher could make such a lively impression.
>
> It would be difficult to make those who did not hear him comprehend in what his delivery consisted. It was so peculiar to him that we can well understand how he had no master in the art and no follower who could imitate him.
>
> When he appeared in the pulpit, his hearers saw him as a man just come from a profound meditation of his subject. His air of

complete recollectedness heralded the greatness and importance of the truths he was to announce. He scarce had moved his lips ere his auditory was captured. When he began to speak, it was not as an orator who had memorized his preachment. Everything came from his own originality. He spoke out of the abundance of the heart, as one unable to repress the surging truths with which he was filled. Devoured by an internal fire, he must contrive an outlet that it may blaze abroad. Everything in him was alive, his whole being spoke, persuaded, moved, softened, brought conviction and emotion into one's heart. This was not at all the result of art in Father Massillon, but a natural talent that led him to self-expression and to an utterance marked by force and vivacity because the result of inward feeling.

He very justly made the merit of delivery consist in this, that the speaker should appear thoroughly penetrated with the truth which he desired to communicate to others. No one has ever carried this talent further than Massillon, according to the testimony of his public, the eulogy passed upon him by all persons of taste.

This fervid appreciation closes with an anecdote. A certain actor, "Le plus parfait qu'ait eu le Théâtre Français", wished to hear Massillon. He was struck with the truthfulness found in his whole action, and remarked to another actor who had accompanied him to church: "My friend, there's an Orator, and we, we are only Comedians."

Now it must be admitted that all this, whilst quite entertaining, is not very enlightening. But, indeed, the eulogist had prefaced his analysis with the appropriate caution that the delivery or "action" of Massillon could not be adequately described to those who had not heard him. One very important thing emerges, nevertheless. The orator was *obviously* thoroughly penetrated with the truth and importance of his message. The young King might miss much of the spoken lesson, but he could not miss the grander lesson that would enter in through the windows of the soul. This unconscious influence of sincerity, piety, conviction, was the sermon preached the most adequately of all—the sermon which any congregation of young folk can appreciate with undoubted profit to their own souls.

Meanwhile, we have on record the full wording of the ten sermons preached to the boy of "nine" years. It may be as helpful to us, as it should be interesting withal, to study Massillon's point of view—his envisaging of the psychology

of such a young auditor, his idea of the pedagogy proper to his sermons, his resulting methods of thought and of expression. It seems clear enough that he succeeded in impressing not alone the adult portion of his little congregation, but the best spirits of his age outside of the Chapel of the Tuileries. His Petit Carême rapidly won first place amongst all his oratorical successes. It would also appear that the young King was deeply impressed. Can we hope to find the secret by a reading of one of the Lenten addresses? Curiously enough, the series begins with a sermon delivered on the Feast of the Purification in the year 1718. The choice of the text was especially striking—certainly, to the auditory, mayhap to the boy himself.

The title of the sermon is: *Des exemples des Grands.* The text is: *Ecce positus est hic in ruinam et in resurrectionem multorum in Israel.* This is followed by the translation of the text in French, and the announcement of the source, *Luc. 2. 34.* In view of Msgr. Meyenberg's approval of such duplications, we may not ascribe this iteration of the text to any pretense of academic display. One can imagine a shiver passing through the assembled Court. For if it be true that *Sicut Rex ita grex,* it was apparently too true of the France of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The "great" must answer, alas! not alone for their own sins, but for those of the multitude who take scandal therefrom. But now to the sermon itself.

Sire,

Such is the destiny of kings and princes of the earth, to be set up for the ruin as well as for the safety of the rest of men; and when Heaven gives them to the world, we may say that they are blessings or public chastisements prepared for the people by its mercy or its justice.

Yes, Sire, on that happy day when you were given to France, and when, carried into the holy temple, the Bishop marked you on the altars with the sacred sign of Faith, it could truly be said of you: This august child is born for the ruin or for the salvation of many.

Jesus Christ himself, taking possession this day, in the temple, of his new kingdom, was not exempt from this law. True it is that his examples, his miracles, and his doctrine, which could assure the salvation of so many sheep in Israel, would not become the occasion of the fall and the scandal of so many others except by their un-

belief, which rendered them still more inexcusable; and that thus the same Gospel which is to be the salvation and redemption of some, should be the ruin and condemnation of the rest.

Happy the princes and the great, if their holiness alone were the occasion of censure and of scandal to corrupt men; and if their examples, like those of Jesus Christ, did not become a stone of offence and condemnation to vice save in making it more inexcusable, by becoming the support and model of virtue.

It is worthy of note that the preacher is repeating the lesson again and again. Even in the inevitable "compliment", which now occurs, he hammers at the same thought:

Thus, my brethren, you whom Providence has elevated above other men, and especially you, Sire, whom God's hand, protector of this monarchy, has drawn forth out of the midst of the ruins and débris of the royal house, in order to place you over us; you, whom it has rekindled as a precious spark in the very bosom of the shadows of death, where it has extinguished all your august race and where you were on the point of extinguishing yourself; yes, Sire, I repeat —behold the destinies that Heaven prepares for you: you are set up for the ruin or the salvation of many: *Positus in ruinam et in resurrectionem multorum in Israel.*

The examples of princes and nobles turn on this inevitable alternative: they can not know how either to lose or to save themselves alone—a capital truth which is to be the subject of this discourse.

The repetition is frequent and insistent and is admirable both in homiletics and in pedagogy, but especially in this latter. The young King could easily appreciate and remember the utterance, even though he might not be able quite to understand the argument upon which it will rest. This argumentation forthwith begins, as follows:

Sire,

Since the primary instinct of peoples is to imitate their kings, the first duty of kings is to give saintly examples to their peoples. Ordinary folk seem to be born just for themselves alone: their vices or their virtues are obscure like their destinies. Mixed up with the crowd, whether they fall or stand is not known to the public; their loss or safety is limited to their own personality; or at least their example may indeed sometimes lead away from the path of virtue, but it has no art to command or authorize vice.

Princes and nobles, on the other hand, appear to be born only for the sake of others. The same rank that directs all eyes toward them, offers them as models; their manners or morals soon form public morality; the supposition is that those who merit our homage are not unworthy of our imitation; the crowd has no other law than the examples of those who command; their life is reproduced, so to speak, in the public; and if their vices find censors, it is ordinarily amongst those very people that imitate them.

The same greatness, therefore, that favors the passions, restrains and governs them; and as 'twas said of old, the more our elevation seems to give us license through authority, the more it takes away because of the proprieties which we must observe.

But whence come these inevitable consequences that the examples of the great always have amongst peoples? Notice this: on the side of the peoples, it is vanity and the desire to please; on the side of the great, it is the extent and perpetuity [of their authority].

Vanity, I say, on the side of the peoples. Yes, my brethren, the world, always inexplicable, has in all times heaped shame both on vice and on virtue. It ridicules the just man; it pierces with a thousand shafts the dissolute man; unruly passions and holy deeds furnish the same target for its laughter and its censures; and by a whimsicality which its caprices alone can justify, it has found the secret of making vice despicable and at the same time of making virtue ridiculous. Now, the examples of dissoluteness among the great, whilst giving authority to vice, give an air of nobility to shame and ignominy and take away from it what is contemptible in the eyes of the public; their passions soon become in others new titles of honor, and vanity alone is able to form imitators of them.

Our nation above all, either very vain, or very frivolous, as we are accused of being; or to speak more justly and to render it greater honor, greatly attached to its rulers and to the nobility, glories in copying their morals as a duty of love to their persons: we are flattered by a resemblance which, bringing us closer to their manners, seems to bring us closer to their rank. Great models make everything honorable; and mere ostentation often draws us into an excess which our own inclination rejects. The City would think itself backward if it did not copy the manners of the Court. The obscure citizen will think, by following the license of the nobility, that he puts on his passions the seal of greatness and nobleness; and the disorder which inclination itself finally wearies of, is perpetuated by our vanity alone.

But, Sire, on the other hand, everything takes its proper place in a State where the nobility, and above all the prince, adore the Saviour. Piety is honored when it has noble examples in its favor. The just

man fears no longer the ridicule cast by the world on virtue, the ridicule that is a stumbling-block in the way of weak souls. There is fear of God, but not of men. Virtue is no longer a stranger in the Court. Disorder no longer holds its head up, but rather hides itself, or puts on the semblance of wisdom. License no longer seems clothed with public authority; and if vice has lost nothing, scandal at least is lessened. In a word, the duties of religion enter into public order, and become a decorum imposed on us by the world itself; worship may still be despised in secret by the impious, but it is at least avenged by public dignity and decorum. The holy temple can still see at the foot of its altars both sinners and unbelievers, but not those who would profane it. The zeal of your august great-grandfather had often punished with severe laws, and always branded with his indignation and displeasure, this scandal in his kingdom. There are still to be found corrupt men who deny their heart to God, but who dare not refuse Him their homage: in a word, it may be still easy for one to lose his soul; but at least it is not shameful for one to save it.

Now if the example of the great serve but to give authority to virtue, to make it respectable on earth, to remove the senseless and impious ridicule which the world heaps upon it, to keep the just safe from the temptations of laughter and censure, to establish the fact that it is not shameful in man to serve the God who made him and keeps him in life and that to worship Him is the most glorious and most honorable duty of His creature and that the title of servant of the Most High is a thousand times grander and more real than all the vain and pompous titles blazoned on the diadems of sovereigns; if the example of the great had no other advantage than this, what honor would ensue to religion, and what abundance of blessings for an empire!

Sire, happy the people that finds its models in its rulers, that can imitate those whom it is obliged to respect, that learns in their examples how to obey their laws, and that is not forced to turn its looks away from those to whom it owes its services!

Thus far we have the development merely of the first point, that vanity alone can make many people imitate the vices of the great. Massillon now takes up the other consideration, that the desire to please will govern others:

But if the examples of the great did not find in the vanity alone of peoples an imitation upon which they could always rely, self-interest and the desire to please would assure them of as many imitators of their actions as their authority makes candidates for their favor.

The young king Roboam forgets the counsels of a father who was the wisest of the kings; a thoughtless group of youths is soon called to fill the highest places, and shares the favors of the king by imitating his dissipations.

It is curious to note that the direful results of this preference by the young Roboam are not alluded to in this discourse. Could Massillon count upon the ready knowledge and memory of the young Louis to supply the moral? Was he really preaching to the young King or rather to his Court? For he immediately continues:

The great always seek applause, and since imitation is the sincerest flattery, one is sure of pleasing from the moment he tries to resemble them: they are delighted to find in their imitators an apology for their vices, and they seek with pleasure in their environment for that which will reassure them against themselves.

Thus ambition, whose pathways are always long and painful, is charmed to open up a shorter and pleasanter way; pleasure, ordinarily not found in the search for fortune, becomes now its artificer and minister; the passions already favored by our inclinations acquire a new zest by the hope of recompense; all motives combine against virtue. And if it is so hard to protect oneself against a vice that pleases, how hard it is not to give oneself over to it when it seems to load us with greater honor!

Such, Sire, is the misfortune of the great whom unjust passions enthrall. Their example corrupts all those who are brought under their authority; whilst distributing their favors, they also spread their vices; all who depend upon them wish to live like them. Sire, esteem nothing in men save the love of duty, and your benefits will fall only upon merit: condemn in others what you know you would not justify in yourself; imitators of the passions of the great are an insult to the vices which they imitate. What a misfortune, if the sovereign who is little willing to give himself to disorder, seems nevertheless to render it sacred by the favors he grants to those who are either the imitators or the ministers of disorder! what shame for an empire! what an indecency to the majesty of a government! what discouragement for a nation, and for capable and virtuous subjects, from whom vice bears away the favors destined as a reward for their talents and their services! what disesteem and reproach for the prince in the judgment of foreign courts! And moreover, what deluge of evils in the people! High offices occupied by corrupt men; the passions formerly visited with disdain now become the pathway to honor and glory; the authority that was established to maintain order and re-

spect for law, merited now by excesses that violate the law; morality corrupted in its source; the stars that should mark our pathway, changed now into will-o-the-wisps that lead us astray; public propriety, of which vice is always jealous, placed among outworn customs, as part of the old sedateness of our fathers; disorder rid of the trouble even of caution; a moderate viciousness become almost as ridiculous as virtue.

But, Sire, if justice and piety in the great replace passions and license, what a source of blessings for the people! Then it is virtue that distributes its favors, and that receives them: honors seek the wise man who deserves, yet flies them; and they avoid the man of iniquity who runs after them: the public functions are confided only to those who devote themselves to the public weal: influence and intrigue lead nowhere; merit and service need naught else but themselves: even the likings of the sovereign do not decide his largesses; to him, nothing in his subjects seems worthy of reward except talents useful to the fatherland: favors always distinguish merit and forthwith reward it; there are no malcontents in the State except idle and useless men. Laziness and mediocrity murmur all alone against the wisdom and justice of the choices; talents are developed by the recompense that waits on them: everybody seeks to make himself useful to the public; and ambition directs all of its cleverness to make itself worthy of the offices to which it aspires. In a word, the people are relieved, the weak sustained, the vicious are left in the mire, the just are honored, God is blessed in the great who hold His place here below: and if a desire to please them should make hypocrites, quite aside from the fact that the mask falls soon or later and that hypocrisy always betrays itself in some fashion, it is at least an homage paid by vice to virtue in honoring itself even with the guise of virtue.

On the side of the peoples such are the consequences of vanity and the desire to please which always attach to the examples of the great; on their side, it is the extent and perpetuity which make them like the signal either of disorder or of virtue amongst men.

This completes the first part of the sermon. Although it takes the form of argumentation, it is throughout really rather a series of briefly stated assertions which paint vivid pictures of two opposed conditions in the State. Whilst a boy's mind might not appreciate the proverbial character of such declarations as: "un hommage que le vice rend à la vertu, en s'honorant même de ses apparences" and the cameo-like precision and condensation of most of the clauses and sentences,

it could perhaps gather a strong impression of the contrasted conditions pictured by the preacher—and that is doubtless more than we could ordinarily expect in an address to very young minds. We are accordingly stimulated to pursue our journey through the remaining part of the sermon. This is marked marginally as "II. Partie".

I say the extent, a stretching of authority (Je dis l'étendue, une étendue d'authorité). How many ministers of their authority do they not involve in their condemnation and their destiny?

If an exaggerated love of glory intoxicate them, they breathe only desolation and war; and then, Sire, how many peoples are sacrificed to the idol of their pride! how much blood is shed that cries for vengeance on their head! how many public calamities, of which they are the sole authors! how many doleful voices rise to heaven against men born for the distress of other men! how many crimes are begotten of a single crime! Could their tears ever wash the fields stained with the blood of so many innocent people? and can their single repentance disarm the wrath of heaven, whilst leaving still behind so many troubles and evils on the earth?

Sire, always look on war as the greatest scourge with which God could afflict an empire: seek to placate your enemies rather than to conquer them; God has not confided the sword to you except for the protection of your people—not for the affliction of your neighbors. The empire over which heaven has placed you is vast enough; be more anxious to relieve its miseries than to extend its limits; make it your glory to repair the evils of past wars rather than to undertake new ones; grant an undying fame to your reign through the happiness of your people rather than the number of your conquests; do not measure the justice of your enterprises by your power to accomplish them; and never forget that in the justest wars, victories always draw after them as many calamities for a State as the bloodiest defeats.

It was a strong preachment to make before King and Court. One wonders if Ben Franklin may not have drawn from it the view credited to him, that the most unjust peace is preferable to the justest war. We are reminded, too, of the hardihood of Chalmers in his sermon on Universal Peace: "We have only to blow the trumpet of war and proclaim to man the hour of his opportunity, that his character may show itself in its essential elements—and that we may see how many in this, our moral and enlightened day, would spring forward as to a

jubilee of delight, and prowl like the wild men of the woods, amidst scenes of rapacity and cruelty and violence." The same courage marked also Massillon's sermon at the "Blessing of the Colors of the Regiment of Catinat". It is given in a condensed and very free translation in O'Mahony's *Great French Sermons* (London, 1917). It is also placed last in the volume of Le Petit Carême from which I have been translating (although it does not belong there chronologically), possibly for the reason that it assails the idea of mere military glory, points out the horrible character of war in respect both of the soldiers and of the victims, and endeavors to mitigate the ferocity of war by a consideration of Christian peace. In the literature of the World War, one should have been pleased to come upon a sermon like this one, with its warning to the soldiery and the prospective recruits: "The very thought of examination of conscience is rejected as dangerous to the courage of a soldier; you plunge more recklessly than ever into pleasures and excesses; and, alas! again and again a poor soul passes from sin and debauchery to death. O God! how awful a fate, and yet how common among such as those to whom I am speaking!" In one piece of recruiting literature that came under my notice, the future soldiers were assured that death on the battle-field was the door to heaven. Massillon next considers the temptation to pleasure:

But if in sovereigns the love of pleasure outweighs that of fame; alas! everything ministers to their passions, everything makes success easy, everything awakens desire, everything lends weapons to voluptuousness. Unworthy subjects show it favor; flatterers give it titles of honor; profane authors embellish it in their song; the arts spend themselves in varying its pleasures; all the talents destined by the Author of nature for the good order and embellishment of civilized life are now made to serve only vice; all become the ministers, and thereby the accomplices, of their unjust passions. Sire, one should weep in greatness! Its resources keep alive the passions which time would exhaust; the diversity of its pleasures quickens anew the satiety inseparable from disorder; the bustle alone, the agitation surrounding the throne, banishes recollectedness, leaving the sovereign not a moment when he can be alone. The very Nathans, the prophets of the Lord, grow mute and weak when approaching the sovereign; everything points without cease to his glory; everything speaks to him of his power; and no one dare show him his weaknesses even from afar.

To the extent of their authority, add the extent of their splendor; the impression and contagion of their examples are not limited to their own nation. The great are a spectacle to the whole universe; their actions pass from mouth to mouth, from province to province, from nation to nation: nothing is hidden in their life; everything belongs to the public: the foreigner, in the most distant courts, has, like the citizen, his eyes fixed on them: they find imitators even where their power makes enemies: the whole world is aware of their virtues or their vices: they are, if I may so say, citizens of the universe; in the midst of all peoples there are events that find source in their examples: they are charged before God with the righteousness or the iniquities of nations; and their vices, or their virtues, have boundaries more extensive than their empire.

France especially, which long since has drawn to itself the eyes of Europe, is more exposed to public view than any other nation. Foreigners come hither in crowds to study our manners and to carry them back to the most distant lands: even the children of kings, forgetting their diversions and the splendor of their own courts, come here as ordinary travelers, substituting for the language and the manners of their own nation, the polish of ours; and, since the throne always draws their first attention, they form themselves either on the wisdom and the moderation, or on the pride and excess, of the prince who occupies it. Sire, show them a sovereign whom they can imitate; let your virtues and the wisdom of your government appeal more forcibly to them than your power; let them marvel rather at the justice of your reign than at the magnificence of your court. Do not show them, as did the King of Juda to the strangers come from Babylon, the riches of the realm, but rather your love for your subjects and their love for you, which is the true wealth of kings. Be the model of good kings, and enkindling thus the admiration of foreigners, you will be the happiness of your own people.

Completing the consideration of the wide reaches of kingly authority in these few paragraphs, Massillon takes up next the question of the longtime consequences of kingly example.

But it is not alone to people of their own times that princes and the great are debtors: their examples have a character of perpetuity that concerns all the ages to come.

The vices or virtues of common men ordinarily die with them: their memory perishes with their person: the Day of Judgment alone will reveal all their actions to the eyes of the universe; but until then, their deeds are buried, and repose in the obscurity of the same tomb that hides their ashes.

But princes and nobles, Sire, belong to all the ages; their life is bound up with public events, and passes on with these from age to age; their passions, whether preserved in public monuments, or immortalized in our histories, or celebrated by a lascivious poesy, will continue to prepare snares down to the remotest posterity: the world is still full of pernicious writings which have transmitted to our own day the disorders of former courts. The profligacies of the great do not die; their examples will continue to preach vice or virtue to our last descendants; and the history of their morals have as long a life as the history of their times.

The mere position occupied by kings and nobles—how many engaging reasons it has for them to cultivate piety and justice! If they find in that position many attractions toward vice, how many powerful motives are there not also for virtue? what noble restraint should accompany actions that shall be written down in unfading characters in the book of posterity! what glory could be higher than to refuse to give oneself to passions and vices whose memory will soil the history of all times and the men of all the ages? what striving is more worthy of praise, than to leave behind examples that shall become the most precious titles of the monarchy, and public monuments of justice and virtue? Finally, what is greater than to be born for the happiness of ages yet to come; to reflect that our examples alone will have a progeny of virtues and of fear of the Lord among men; and that out of our very ashes, from age to age, will arise princes who shall be like unto ourselves?

Such, Sire, is the career of good kings; and such was your august great-grandfather, that great king whom we shall always set before you as a model. Alas! He will be that for all the kings to come. Never forget those last moments when this heroic old man, like Simeon in the Gospel of this day, holding you in his arms, bathing you with his fatherly tears, and offering to the God of his fathers this precious remnant of his royal race, departed this life with joy because his eyes had seen the miraculous child whom God still reserved for the salvation and the glory of Israel.

This high-flown tribute to Louis XIV. was not without pedagogical value. The young king would naturally be instructed only in the virtues of the great Louis. And such a model would be near him both in blood and in time. Not the disgrace that awaits vice, but the nobility surrounding virtue, is the proper lesson for enthusiastic and as yet incorrupt youth.

Sire, never lose from sight this grand spectacle, this Father of Kings dying, and seeing revive in you alone the hope of all his extinguished posterity recommending your childhood to the tender and respectable guardian [Madame la Duchesse de Vantadour] of your primary education, who in forming your first inclinations and, so to say, your first words, was on the point of receiving your last sighs; confiding the sacred deposit of your person to the pious prince [Le Duc de Maine] who inspires you with sentiments worthy of your blood; to the illustrious Marshal [le Maréchal de Villeroy] who has received as a hereditary virtue the science of bringing up kings and who, become one of the first subjects of the State, will teach you to become the greatest king of your times; to the faithful prelate [l'ancien Evêque de Fréque] who, having governed his Church with wisdom, would form in your person his most zealous protector; finally, to the whole nation, of which you are at once the precious Pupil and the Father.

A severer taste of to-day might find fault with the apparently lavish praise distributed, in this one paragraph, upon five notable persons, and might be inclined humorously to recall Sairey Gamp's compliments so carefully inclusive of everybody within hearing. But quite apart from the kindly custom of the olden time, there was in the present case a pardonably shrewd diplomacy of psychological suggestion. Massillon showed himself, in this sermon as always elsewhere, an uncompromising denouncer of the failings of "the great". "There is much truth (as well as some finesse) in Goethe's maxim that if you would improve a man it is no bad thing to let him suppose that you already think him that which you would have him to be" (O'Mahony, *Preface* to *Great French Sermons,* Second Series). I am not sufficiently conversant with the true history of Louis XV.'s reign to offer any philosophic comment upon the traditionally asserted failure of that monarch to live up to the excellent training received in his early childhood. He has been pictured in history as a prime degenerate whose outlook on life and destiny is summed up in the cynical declaration, *Après moi le déluge!* In his recent advocacy of a monarchical régime for France, Leon Daudet lauds the progress of France under her kings, and concludes his appreciation with this thought: "Under the most maligned of them—and unjustly maligned—Louis XV., France acquired Lorraine and Corsica."

And now for the closing paragraphs of the sermon, containing the exhortations or "moral application" of this initial sermon of Le Petit Carême.

Sire, may you ever have in memory the maxims of wisdom which this great prince bequeathed to you in his last moments, as a heritage more precious than his crown.

He exhorted you to bring solace to your people. Be a father to them, and you will be doubly their master.

He inspired you with a horror of war, and besought you not to follow his example in that respect. Be a peaceful prince. The most glorious conquests are those which win hearts.

He counseled you to fear the Lord. Walk before Him in innocence; you will reign happily only in so far as you reign holily.

Sire, may the last words of this great king, this patriarch of your royal family, be like those of the dying patriarch Jacob, prophecies of what should one day come to your race; and may his last precepts become the prophecy of your reign.—Amen.

One could fairly surmise that this sermon of some four thousand words should prove fatiguing to the attention of so young a listener. The second sermon, nevertheless, contains over five thousand words on "The Temptations of the Great," while the third, on "The Respect the Great Owe to Religion," has six thousand words. Again, one notes the almost complete absence in the sermons of "stories" or even very brief word-paintings. Nathan and Roboam in the first sermon, and glancing allusions to David, Solomon, Joas, Achab, Isaac and Rebecca, Esther, Josaphat, Nathan, and Joseph in the remaining sermons, are almost the only "illustrations" which the orator permits himself. Should we revise the common estimate of their necessity in addresses to children?

H. T. HENRY

Washington, D. C.

A THOUGHT FOR HOLY THURSDAY.

IN the December number of the REVIEW attention was drawn to the argument used by Lainez at the Council of Trent to prove that Our Lord offered Himself in the Supper, and it was pointed out that the statement was unanswerable: "If Our Lord did not offer Himself in the Supper, we are not offering Him in the Mass, since we are doing only what He did and bade us do." I pointed out also that the same argument, carried to its logical conclusion, results in this other statement: "If Our Lord did not offer His Passion in the Supper we are not offering it in the Mass, seeing that we are only doing what He did and bade us do." As it is a poor rule that doesn't work both ways, if we are offering His Passion in the Mass, He must first have offered it in the Supper, and His Sacrifice was not consummated till He underwent His Passion; till He actually gave the Father what He offered in the Supper—His Life for the ransom of many.

But how are we to know that what we offer in the Mass is the Passion of the Lord? We know it from the traditional teaching of the Church. "The Passion of the Lord," says St. Cyprian, "is the Sacrifice that we offer." St. Augustine tells us that the Sacrifice of our Ransom was offered up for the soul of his mother; St. Chrysostom, that "Christ who was slain for us is the Sacrifice that is laid upon" our altars; St. Ambrose that the Mass is "that saving Sacrifice whereby the sins of the world are blotted out"; St. Ignatius Martyr that it is "the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ which suffered for our sins" that is offered in the Mass; Theodoretus, that "any one who is versed in divine things knows that we offer not another sacrifice"; Alger the Scholastic, that "if our daily sacrifice were other than that which was once offered in Christ, it would not be true but superfluous"; Peter the Venerable that "that whereof it is said, Christ was offered once (Heb. 9:28), He left to His Church evermore to be offered up"; and St. Thomas of Aquin, voicing the tradition of all the ages, that "the Sacrifice which is offered daily in the Church is not other than the Sacrifice which Christ Himself offered" and "offered once", as St. Paul declares. Exact references will be found at the foot of pages 16 to 18 of my book on the Mass. Let it be noted also that when St. Thomas identifies the Mass with "the

Sacrifice which Christ Himself offered", he plainly implies that Christ offered one only sacrifice, or, as St. Paul has it, that "by one oblation He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified".

The Church herself makes vocal in the prayers of the Mass her age-long belief concerning the Sacrifice, according to the time-honored maxim that the formula or rule of prayer shall establish the law of believing—*Legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi.* Here is the Secret of the Mass for the Ninth Sunday after Pentecost:

As often as this commemorative Sacrifice is celebrated the work of our redemption is carried on.

It was by the Passion our redemption was wrought, and so the Mass, which carries on the work, must be intimately linked up with the Passion.

And here is the Secret of the Mass for the Thursday of the third week in Lent:

We offer Thee, O Lord, on occasion of the precious death of Thy servant, this Sacrifice which is the fountain-source of all martyrdom.

Plainly this is the Passion—the sacrifice offered by Our Lord what time He came from Edom, with dyed garments from Bosra.

Follows the Secret of the Mass on Wednesday in Holy Week:

Accept, O Lord, we beseech Thee, the offering we have made, and mercifully grant that we may piously receive what we celebrate in the Mystery of Our Lord's Passion.

We celebrate, therefore, that is, commemorate and offer, the Lord's Passion in the Mystery of Faith which is the Mass.

On the Feast of the Spear and Nails the Secret of the Mass runs:

May this holy and spotless evening Sacrifice sanctify us, O Lord, we beseech Thee, which Thy Only Begotten Son offered up on the Cross for the salvation of the world.

What did Our Lord offer up on the Cross for the salvation of the world? His Passion—His sufferings and death. This, therefore, is what we are offering up in the Mass, seeing that we are but continuing to do what He did and bade us do.

"May this Sacrifice be acceptable to Thy Majesty," is what we say in the Secret of the Mass for the Feast of the Five Wounds, "in which we offer Thee the very wounds of Thy Only Begotten Son as the price of our redemption."

From this we gather that Our Lord first offered in the Supper the wounds that were to be inflicted upon Him in His Passion, else we should not be offering them in the Mass.

"Grant, we beseech Thee, O Lord," we read in the Secret of the Mass for a man deceased, "that this Sacrifice may profit the soul of Thy servant by the immolation of which Thou didst set the whole world free from the bonds of sin."

Christ was immolated on the Cross, and there set the world free from the bonds of sin. But He offered Himself in the Supper, as was defined by the Council of Trent. It follows that He offered Himself in the Supper to be immolated on the Cross, and that it is the immolation on the Cross that is operative in the Mass, and sets each successive generation free from the bonds of sin.

Let me cite one more prayer of the Mass, the Postcommunion on the Feast of the Spear and Nails:

> O Lord Jesus Christ, who didst offer Thyself upon the Cross, a spotless and willing Victim to God the Father, we earnestly pray that the most holy offering of the same Sacrifice may obtain for us pardon of our sins and everlasting glory.

The Council of Trent has defined that Our Lord offered Himself to God the Father in the Supper. This prayer says that He offered Himself to God the Father on the Cross. Did He, then, offer Himself twice? No; St. Paul assures us that He offered Himself once and was once offered. The offering in the Supper is continued in the Mass, and this prayer says that the Mass is "the most holy offering of the same Sacrifice" that was offered on the Cross. The full statement of the matter, then, is this: Christ offered in the Supper, continued to offer on the Cross, and continues to offer evermore in the Mass by the hands of His priests the One Sacrifice that takes away the sins of the world. We, miserable sinners that we are, need nothing short of the Sacrifice of Calvary, and by the great goodness and mercy of God that and no other we have in the Holy Mass.

It should not be hard to choose between the traditional teaching and belief of the Church, as outlined above, on the one hand, and, on the other, a multiplicity of conflicting theories, which, by the very fact that they are multiple and conflicting and mutually destructive, serve but to advertise to the world the futility of private judgment in matters of faith.

And the choice has to be made. If the Supper was a finished sacrifice, the Mass is the continuation of it, and we haven't the Sacrifice of Calvary at all. It stands by itself out of all liturgical relation with the Supper and the Mass, and is not continued. Suppose the Missouri River did not form a junction with the Mississippi, no drop of water from that red stream would ever pass into the Gulf of Mexico at New Orleans. Even so, if the Supper and the Cross were not in liturgical conjunction, the red tide of Calvary would not be mingling with the blue waters of the Cenacle upon our altars to-day. Is it not the word spoken in the Supper that reproduces in the Mass the Blood that was shed upon the Cross? The Supper and the Cross are, therefore, indissolubly bound together in the Mass.

Let me add a word or two in view of the book notice which appears in the February number, pp. 217, 218.

The "oblation" theory of sacrifice put forward by French theologians of the seventeenth century is a reaction from the "immolation" theory in vogue at the time, justly and piquantly described as "the painful effort of theologians to inflict a species of death" upon the Lord of glory in the Mass. It involved a passage from one extreme to the other; from the idea that the whole essence of sacrifice consists in the destruction of the victim to the idea that the whole essence consists in the oblation. The true idea is that it consists in both, oblation on the part of the priest, and immolation on the part of the victim. The outstanding thing in the Supper is the oblation, on the Cross the immolation.

The theory of Father Lepin's book, equally with the more commonly accepted destruction theories, rests on the fundamentally false assumption that the Mass is other than the Sacrifice of Calvary, whereas the traditional teaching of the Church from the beginning makes it to be, not other, but identically the same. The words of Sutrinus at the Council of Trent voice the age-long belief of the Church: "We have no sacrifice but that by which we were redeemed."

ALEX. MACDONALD.

EASTER CAROLS AND CAROLING.

THOUGH we associate carols with songs of praise in honor of the Nativity of our Blessed Lord, yet the glorious feast of Easter, the feast of His Resurrection also lays claim to carols which are particularly its own. It is from the soil of monastic life, that have blossomed some of the rarest flowers of Christian Catholic poetry, which constitute our Easter carols. There could be little, one might think, in the stern and rigorous existence behind the gray walls of the monastery, with its fastings and castigations, its penances and prayers, and its isolation from the light and beauty of the world, to stimulate the imagination, or to call into exercise the poetic faculty. Thus would the worldling reason with himself. But the monk had already at hand the Old Testament imagery, rich in a symbolism in which, by a poetry touched with divine inspiration, there were shadowed forth the mystery and glory of the later dispensation. The life and sufferings of our Divine Saviour Jesus Christ, with the attendant associations, offered an exhaustless theme, to be used by turns to interpret ancient types and symbols, or to quicken a flagging faith in a blessedness yet to be revealed. If ever he lacked themes, his own heart with its victories and defeats, its revolt against the impurities of the world, and its aspirations toward the heavenly existence, supplied them; and he had for the vehicle of his devotion a language marvelously sonorous and flexible, and capable of becoming stately or rugged, or tender, in harmony with his thought.

It is true that the medieval Easter carol was restricted in scope, and that its concepts often surprise us by their grotesque realism; but the intense feeling which the carols convey is a quality which helps us to forget such defects. Holding himself aloof from the domestic associations, which call out the natural affections, the monk poured forth all the fervor of his soul in these carols. This feeling is as far removed from our own time in spirit, as it is in distance; and there is nothing in the sacred poetry of the modern tongues to equal the grandeur of the medieval Easter carols. They are so musical and so rapturous as to appeal even to the dullest ear.

The medieval carol has as its particular theme the Resurrection of our Blessed Lord and Saviour. Our own conditions

are such as to place us, perhaps, a little out of sympathy with the feeling which these carols convey. Our present existence has so much that is desirable, that we are in danger of finding it both engrossing and satisfying; and it is only after we are taught, by some sharp affliction, the uncertainty of this life, that we begin to fix our aspirations upon the life to come. But the monk found little to content him, either in the gloom and discipline of the monastery, or in the wild unrest of the world outside. In the solitude of his cell, he dreamed and sang of Paradise, and of the Resurrection of Christ, as an assurance of an abundant entrance thereinto.

The earliest Easter carol of which we have knowledge, carries us back fifteen centuries. Its author, St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, was born not many years after the recognition of Christianity by the decree of Constantine, probably about the year 340 A. D. Treves was probably his birthplace. The story of his life is like a romance, although the leading facts in it are clearly established. His carols are terse, simple and vigorous, and are written in a stanza which lacks the charm of rhyme. The Easter carol, beginning "Hic est dies verus Dei" is one of the very few of his writing, the authenticity of which is unquestioned. The following is the translation of this carol, which has become one of the most popular in our day:

This is the very day of God,
Serene with holy light it came,
In which the stream of sacred blood
Swept over the world's crime and shame.

O admirable Mystery,
The sins of all are laid on Thee;
And Thou to cleanse the world's deep stain,
As man dost bear the sins of men.

Death's fatal spear himself doth wound,
With his own fetters he is bound.
Lo, dead the Life of all men lies,
That life anew for all might rise.

Two centuries intervene between Ambrose and the next poet who sang of Easter, Venantius Fortunatus. Among the singers of the early Church, there is no greater contrast of temperament and character, than that which exists between these poets.

Ambrose was stern, simple, fearless, profoundly earnest; Fortunatus was gay, light-hearted, often trifling, and as skilled in turning society verses as in the writing of carols. His carols are among the most valued treasures of sacred song. His Easter carol, "Salve festa dies," which is his best, is often sung:

Hail, day of days, in peals of praise,
Throughout all ages owned,
When Christ our God, hell's empire trod,
And high o'er heaven was throned.

This glorious morn, the world new-born,
In rising beauty shows;
How, with her Lord to life restored,
Her gifts and graces rose.

As star by star He mounts afar,
And hell imprisoned lies,
Let stars and light and depth and height
In Alleluias rise.

Ambrose and Fortunatus wrote in unrhymed verse. It was left for the poets of a later day, and for those chiefly of the twelfth century, to play upon the sonorous Latin tongue as upon the keys of a mighty organ. Not that rhyme was an invention of the Christian poets, nor an importation from without. Of the sacred singers of the twelfth century, there are none whose lives afford more interesting and ampler materials for study than Bernard of Clairvaux. There was in his nature a combination of gentleness and fierceness, of humility and ambition, of fervor and severity which constitutes him the representative monk of his time. Among the carols of exquisite beauty which we owe to this rarely gifted spirit is one which deserves a high place in the Easter festivities. The original contains about two hundred lines, and is a jubilation on the name of Jesus. The following is the translation which is most familiar to us all, and which is described as the sweetest and most evangelical carol of the Middle Ages:

Jesus, the very thought of Thee
With sweetness fills my breast;
But sweeter far Thy face to see,
And in Thy presence rest.

With Mary to Thy tomb I'll haste,
Before the dawning skies,
And all around with longing cast
My soul's inquiring eyes.

Beside Thy grave will make my moan,
And sob my heart away;
Then at Thy feet sit trembling down,
And there adoring stay.

Nor from my tears and sighs refrain,
Nor those dear feet release,
My Jesus, till from Thee I gain
Some blessed word of peace.

While Bernard was defending the interests of the monks of Clairvaux with much zeal, Peter the Venerable was at the head of a monastery at Cluny. He was a man of great gentleness and beauty of character, and his rule over the Cluny monks was of extreme mildness. Not many of his writings have come down to us, but his Easter carol is a marvel of ingenious and musical rhyme. Let us listen to a few lines in the translation:

Lo, the gates of death are broken,
And the strong man armed is spoiled;
Of his armor which he trusted,
By the Stronger Arm despoiled.
Vanquished is the prince of hell,
Smitten by the Cross he fell.

Then the purest light resplendent
Shone those seats of darkness through,
When, to save whom He created,
God willed to create anew.
That the sinner might not perish,
For him the Creator dies;
By whose death our dark lot changing,
Life again for us doth rise.

There is no other of the medieval poets, who left to the Church so rich a legacy of song and carols, as Adam of St. Victor. He had supreme command over form and rhyme so that his carols are marvels of melody. His profound acquaintance with the whole circle of theology of his time, and eminently with the exposition of the Scriptures; the abundant and

admirable use which he makes of it, the exquisite art and variety with which for the most part his verse is managed and his rhymes disposed, their rich melody multiplying and ever deepening at the close; the strength which often he concentrates into a single line; his skill in conducting a story; and most of all the evident nearness of the things which he celebrates to his own heart of hearts—these and other excellences render him the foremost among the sacred poets of the Middle Ages. Among the best of his Easter carols is that, the first two stanzas of which are here given:

Now the world's fresh dawn of birth
  Teems with new rejoicing rife;
Christ is rising and on earth
  All things with Him rise to life.
Feeling this memorial day,
Him the elements obey,
  Serve and lay aside their strife.

Gleamy fire flits to and fro,
  Throbs the everlasting air;
Water without pause doth flow,
  And the earth stands firm and fair;
Light creations upward leap,
Heavier to the center keep,
  All things renovation share.

Let us listen to one more carol, from some unknown poet of the fourteenth century or possibly of the sixteenth. Hark how jubilantly he calls upon everything in nature, sky and air, the awakening spring, lilies and violets, hills, valleys and fountains, to join in the exultation over the Risen Lord:—

Smile praises, O sky, soft breathe them, O air,
Below and on high and everywhere.
The black troop of storms has yielded to calm;
Tufted blossoms are peeping, and early palm.

Awake thee, O Spring, ye flowers, come forth,
With thousand hues tinting the soft green earth;
Ye violets tender and sweet roses bright,
Gay Lent lilies blended with pure lilies white.

Sweep, tides of rich music, the world along,
And pour in full measure, sweet lyres, your song,
Sing, sing, for He liveth, He lives as He said;
The Lord has arisen, unharmed from the dead.

Clap, clap your hands, mountains, ye valleys, resound.
Leap, leap for joy, fountains, ye hills, catch the sound.
All triumph; He liveth, He lives as He said;
The Lord has arisen unharmed from the dead.

Compared with the older Easter carols, those of the modern era approach the style of the oratorio, and are not so advantageous for carol work. For a person educated in church music, no better or fitting works were ever written than the following oratorio choruses, which have the spirit and style of the carol: "Achieved is the Glorious Work" by Haydn; the inevitable "Hallelujah Chorus" by Handel; the "Hallelujah Chorus" from the "Mount of Olives" by Beethoven; "All Glory to the Lamb That Died" from the "Last Judgment" by Spohr; "The Trump shall Sound," "I Know that My Redeemer Liveth", "Thou Didst Not Leave His Soul in Hell," from Handel's "Messiah." Easter carols of a more simple style, approaching the form of the anthem, are; "In the Gloom of Easter Morn" by Parkhurst; Springer's "Easter Alleluia"; Mozart's "Resurrexit"; and "Easter Hymn" by Oliver.

The carol, unlike most music compositions, seems to require a peculiar oneness of idea expressed in a simple line of melodious thought, to fulfill the concept which has been wrought by immemorial centuries of practice. Our modern Easter carols preclude the idea which underlies true carolry. Only a rustical age could produce such things without affectation.

No further need we speak of the Easter carol. Large numbers are of late origin, but the form is old and cannot be revived. Carolry for the greater part is identical with folk song. It is also older. From the angelic hymn which had its echo in the carol of the shepherds, and the Alleluias of Easter morn, down through the ages, an endless train of poetry and music has sprung up to commemorate these two great events in the Redemption of the human race. A true carol sings of the twofold Birth of Christ, at Bethlehem and at the Resurrection. This is the elemental idea of every carol.

The cradle of the human race has its song which is endless. And just as in pre-Christian times, "everything that has breath" is invoked not otherwise than the stars, winds, dews, frosts, lightnings, green things, fish, fowls and beasts—as the poetical universe is laid under contribution, so too, has Music paid her tribute with every possible kind of melody, symphony and oratorical song.

F. J. KELLY.

Detroit, Mich.

CALUMNY AND THE POPES.

II.

PIUS IX EXONERATED.

ALTHOUGH every Catholic writer without exception speaks of the early life of Pius IX as absolutely free from reproach, still such slanders as those discussed in my previous article are apt to leave an uncomfortable feeling behind them that there may be some skeleton in the cupboard, some dark page which the partiality of ardent eulogists has pasted down and studiously refrained from investigating. So abundant were the tributes paid to the high character of Pius IX in his later years even by those who were not Catholics[1] that any discussion of the evidence seems almost superfluous, but by a piece of good fortune we possess, regarding that same period of his career which has been most foully calumniated, the testimony of a hostile witness whose opportunities of obtaining accurate information were exceptionally great. John Baptist Nicolini, who describes himself as "Deputy to the Tuscan Constituent Assembly and Officer of the General Staff of the Roman Army", was a revolutionary of the most extreme type. He was the friend of such men as Mazzini, Saffi, Garibaldi and Father Gavazzi. Like them he was a political refugee both before and after the Roman Revolution of 1849. On both occasions he sought refuge in the British Isles and there he produced in English two or three books, notably a *History of the Jesuits,* which to this day remains one of the

[1] As a single illustration I may refer to F. Hitchman's *Pius IX, a Biography,* London, 1878. The book is dedicated to Mr. Alfred Austin who later became Poet Laureate.

most venomous attacks upon the Order ever written. But what especially concerns us here is a life of Pius IX which Nicolini published in Edinburgh in 1851. As we shall see, the author informs us that he was himself brought up in Sinigaglia and was intimately acquainted with all the family of the Mastai, more especially with Count Joseph, the Pope's brother.[2] The importance of this becomes manifest when the fact is recalled that eight or ten years later the calumnious pens of Pianciani, Vésinier and others were proclaiming to the world that Sinigaglia had rung with the excesses and debauchery of Pius IX (Giovanni Mastai)in his youth. At the risk of a long quotation it will be best to leave Nicolini, writing, be it remembered, in the year 1850 or 1851, to speak for himself. What follows is taken from the first chapter of his short biography of Pius IX.

The life of a man who, within the brief compass of a few months, has been adored almost as a god and execrated as the worst of tyrants, cannot fail to excite the deepest interest. By the people of England, more especially, must this interest be strongly felt since it is this same man whose wanton imprudence has but lately disturbed their tranquility,[3] and who even now tries to raise rebellion and civil war in Ireland.

Brought up in the Pope's native town, intimately acquainted with all his family, personally connected with many of the principal events of his pontificate, I have thought myself qualified to relate his history, if not as an accomplished writer, at least as a well-informed biographer.

In narrating the history of Pius IX, it shall be my endeavour to forget nothing, to omit nothing, however good or bad it may be. He shall be praised and blamed, whenever in my humble opinion he deserves it. Although in these times of excitement impartiality may be but a poor recommendation, yet I intend not to libel the man but to write his history. . . . .

I shall confine to a page or two the early life of Giovanni Mastai. He was born at Sinigaglia on the 13th June 1792. He was the

[2] This assertion is confirmed by other statements made by Nicolini in his *Life of Father Gavazzi.* In this latter work (p. 5), speaking of the year 1846, he says, "After having been 18 years in exile, I returned before the middle of Nov. to Sinigaglia, where my family resided". And then he goes on to speak of his talks with Count Joseph Mastai.

[3] The reference of course is to the so-called "Papal Aggression" of 1850 when Pius IX restored the hierarchy in England.

seventh child of Count Mastai, one of those of our noblemen, who possess a splendid palace, an ancient name, a magnificent genealogical tree, and a revenue of from two to four hundred pounds. Giovanni, the youngest of the family, perceiving that, like all others similarly situated, he must either maintain himself or be contented with a scanty pittance at the board of his eldest brother, determined to become either a soldier or a priest. After some hesitation he betook himself to the trade of the latter, as the less dangerous and more lucrative. He became, then, a priest, and, setting aside his superstitious strictness in the observance of the external forms of religion, *a very exemplary one.* Being a patrician and a bigot, he quickly advanced in the career of honour and dignity. He became a Prelate, a Bishop, and, at the death of Gregory XVI, he was Cardinal Archbishop of Imola. In each of these capacities few would have acted more praiseworthily than did Mastai. A stranger to political intrigue—assiduous in performing his pastoral duties—charitable to the poor—the friend and consoler of the afflicted—strictly moral in his private life—he was most dearly beloved by his flock. The meekness of his character—his perfect freedom from political bias—the hope entertained by all the other cardinals of domineering over a Pope entirely uninterested in temporal affairs—all contributed to his being elevated to the Chair of St. Peter. After only two days' conclave, on the 16th June 1846 he was elected Pope and assumed the name of Pius IX.[4]

A little further on Nicolini continues thus:

When the new Pope was elected, the Romans, who were ready to revolt, determined to try their last experiment. If a man like Giovanni Mastai, whose pure and uncontaminated life—whose piety, meekness and charity everyone admired—should prove no better than the former Popes—then all was over and Popery would have ceased to reign over Italy.

All minds were in great suspense and anxiety, but Pius IX soon relieved them. Urged by his friends, who were liberals, and prompted also by his own compassionate heart, on July 16th, a month after his accession to the papal throne, he proclaimed a large and generous amnesty. . . . The Roman States never witnessed such exultation. . . . On my return from exile, I was told by parents, and by the Pope's own brothers, that many of the unfortunate inhabitants of the Romagna, whose chains Pius had broken, came to

[4] *The History of the Pontificate of Pius the Ninth,* by G. B. Nicolini of Rome, Deputy to the Tuscan Constituent Assembly and Officer of the General Staff of the Roman Army. Edinburgh 1851, pp. 2-3.

his palace at Sinigaglia and after having exhausted all other expressions of gratitude, contrived to detach from the walls of the house a portion of the cement, which they carried home to their families as a sacred relic.[5]

Nicolini goes on to urge that the flattery turned the Pope's head, and also that he was weak and easily wrought upon by the advocates of a repressive policy. But he never disputes his integrity of life. For example he says: "Assuredly the renown of the Pope's virtues has brought many Protestants to the Romish Church."[6] "The conduct of the Pope was irreproachable",[7] but he adds that "Count Joseph, the Pope's own brother who had been an exile and was a patriot, conversing upon our hopes and fears with the author of this work, said 'I am afraid that they will work upon his feeble and timorous conscience. If they persuade him that it is a sin to concede any reform we are lost'. He was right."[8]

When Nicolini used this language he was writing of what he had learnt at first hand. His own frequent references to this or the other member of the Mastai family,[9] show that, as he declares, he was intimately acquainted with them all. He had been brought up in the same spot and they were the principal people of the district. Neither could he have any possible motive for bearing witness to Mastai's innocent youth. As a rule he depicts the priests to whom he refers as steeped in debauchery. He carries his anti-clerical fanaticism so far as to declare that a vast correspondence found upon the premises of the Dominicans in Rome proved that "in almost every one of these letters the writer had VIOLATED THE SECRETS OF THE CONFESSIONAL"—the small capitals are Nicolini's own. Again he paints a most appalling picture of the immorality of Pope Gregory XVI[10] and of Cardinal Antonelli—though, be it noticed, he pretends here to no personal knowledge. He is clearly only echoing the vile gossip of the revolutionaries among whom he lived. Of his readiness to speak in the most denunciatory terms, even of Pius IX himself, after the liberal policy of the first years of his pontificate had been reversed,

[5] Nicolini, p. 8.
[6] p. 10.
[7] p. 11.
[8] Nicolini ibid., p. 11.
[9] See e. g. p. 60 note & p. 63.
[10] Of this I shall have something to say in a future article.

it is hardly necessary to multiply proofs. On page 26 he tells us that "after the bombardment of Rome Pius was execrated by every honest Italian heart"; on page 30 he speaks of "his deceitful and hypocritical policy"; on page 40 he calls him "the heartless and hypocritical Pius", on page 41 he apostrophizes the Pope thus: "O worthy friend of Ferdinand of Naples! profane no longer the name of the Almighty, cease to call thyself His representative! but take at once the only name that posterity will accord thee, that of TYRANT", and this tone is maintained throughout the rest of the book. For example, p. 56: "The conduct of the Pope henceforth became nothing but a series of schemes to deceive his subjects. His position was critical, but he trusted in the Jesuitical art and the notoriously barefaced impudence of Priestcraft to bring him safely out of it". On page 87 he says: "It was Mastai, who once a mild charitable man had become a cruel and vindictive despot". Further we have to remember that at the time this volume was penned Nicolini was in perfect safety, living under the British flag and writing in English for a public who just after the famous "papal aggression" of 1850 would have been ready enough to receive any highly colored narrative of the scandalous excesses of Mastai's youth.[11] None the less in the Preface of the volume, written, as the contents show, after the little work was completed, he again refers to the subject in the same self-laudatory tone!

I have rendered to all [he says], including the greatest enemies of my own party, that justice which is their due. I have respected every conviction and opinion which, although contrary to my own, I have believed to be conscientiously held and to spring from pure sources. I rejoiced to relate the noble qualities and the kind disposition of Giovanni Mastai, and I would have been glad to have shown, through every page of my book, my gratitude to the giver of the amnesty. But the truth must be told. The wrongs inflicted upon an entire nation cannot pass unavenged; and if adverse circumstances prevent us from effectually subduing the cruel oppressor, we must at least consign his name to the maledictions of posterity.[12]

[11] The lectures of Gavazzi and Achilli were the sensations of the hour.

[12] Preface, pp. xiii–xiv. Nicolini seems never to have receded from this presentment of the early life of Pius IX. In his *History of the Jesuits,* the preface to which is dated 1859, he still speaks of "the meekness of his character and the purity of his life" pp. 470-471 (Ed[n] 1893). Gavazzi also has nothing evil to say of the early years of Pius IX. See his *Lectures in New York,* (1853) p. 229.

Nicolini's volume, insignificant in size and appearance—it ran to no more than about 150 pages—seems to have attracted little attention. I cannot find that a second edition was ever published or that it was translated into any foreign language. It was not of course a book that would have been read by Catholics, while for Protestants of the extreme No-Popery type—the only people of English speech who were particularly interested in the Vatican—such tributes as those we have just quoted, vouching as they do for the personal integrity of Mastai, would have rendered the history very tame reading indeed.

It is to a large extent characteristic of the vile stories which this testimony of Nicolini so conclusively contradicts that they are protected from discussion, and consequently from refutation, by their very nastiness. Even if the law of libel in any particular country[13] had permitted an appeal to the courts of justice the question would always arise whether the advantages of a favorable verdict would outweigh the risks and drawbacks inevitably entailed by a prosecution. Not least among them must be reckoned—first, the increased publicity given to the charge by legal proceedings, secondly the expense necessarily incurred, thirdly, the loss of dignity involved in the appeal to an outside tribunal—an appeal which might seem to imply that the appellant could not afford to treat such aspersions with silent contempt—and lastly the danger that failure upon some technical point of law might be interpreted as failure to prove the baselessness of the accusation itself. On the other hand the charges were in their own nature such that the only adequate disproof lay in the accuser's inability to substantiate them legally when challenged to do so. If any malicious person chooses to circulate a report that the relations between the Abbé A. and Signora B. when they meet in the confessional or elsewhere are of an improper character, it is impossible to bring positive evidence to establish the contrary. The burden

[13] Nothing could be more significant than the fact that the libels published against Pius IX during his life-time were issued under circumstances which would have made any legal remedy practically impossible. *La Rome des Papes* of Pianciani appeared without the author's name and was printed in Switzerland in 1859-1861. Vésinier's *Life of Pius IX* both in the French and the German edition was produced in Berlin in 1862. Petruccelli della Gattina's book saw the light in Brussels in 1866. Vésinier's scandalous novel *Mœurs Impériales* 1868, was brought out in London.

of proof must rest with the accuser and if he chooses to confine himself to vague generalities and to an appeal to common report, very little can be done. We have, therefore, almost reason to be grateful to the calumniators of the papacy when a definite allegation is made which can be dealt with without outraging the ears of decent people and without having recourse to a court of law. For this reason although it may seem that the allegation that Pius IX had been initiated as a Freemason is a matter of very slight importance, I venture to devote a page or two to the story of this famous controversy. It will illustrate better than anything else can do the unscrupulousness of the rabid anticlericalism in which nineteen-twentieths of the evil stories about the papacy have ultimately had their origin.

The earliest reference which I have been able to trace in print to the supposed initiation of J. M. Mastai as a Mason is again to be found in *La Rome des Papes* by Pianciani published in 1859. It is characteristic of this writer that he practically contradicts himself in the statements he makes about it. On the one hand he declares that Mastai was pressed to become a Mason at Sinigaglia but was probably deterred by fear of excommunication, on the other he asserts that Crétineau-Joly later on discovered some Masonic documents implicating Pius and endeavored to blackmail the Pontiff by threats of publishing them.[14] However it may be with Pianciani, Vésinier and Petruccelli della Gattina at any rate state unhesitatingly that Mastai joined a Masonic lodge. What is of more importance, T. Adolphus Trollope, who, as we have seen, rejects in emphatic language the charges of early debauchery brought against the Pope, believes that in this matter he has probably not been maligned.

> It has constantly been asserted [he says] and as constantly denied, that the young Mastai was a Mason. It is exceedingly probable, considering the complexion of the times and the liberalising tendencies of his then surroundings, that he did become a member of the order. Nor is there the slightest reason for deeming it any ground of censure that he should have done so; or for thinking that it is *on that ground* impossible that he should subsequently have looked at the matter from a papal point of view.[15]

[14] Pianciani, *La Rome des Papes*, II, pp. 365-367.

[15] Trollope, *Pius IX*, I, p. 10 note.

The point, of course, is that if Mastai, whether as lay Catholic or cleric, became a Freemason he acted in defiance of a most grave and perfectly well understood prohibition of the Church. If Pius IX as a young man had been the debauchee and the hypocrite that his enemies pretend, then his initiation as a Mason would be quite probable, but otherwise the reverse would be the case. Those who made this allegation were perfectly aware that such a lapse from the obligations of a Catholic would be fatal to the popular conception of Pius as an innocent lad who had consecrated his heart to God from early youth. As a result of this state of feeling, the assertion that Pius IX had been a Mason was indignantly contradicted by Catholics, while on the other hand many anticlericals were eager to discover documentary evidence which would place the allegation beyond dispute. As usual, the Pope's assailants were not wanting in audacity. The mere absence of anything that could be called evidence, did not deter them from circulating the most precise statements on the subject. It would be useless to multiply illustrations. Let the following sentence from a work published as late as 1880 serve as a specimen of the rest: "In 1805," says Lachâtre in his account of Pius IX, "Mastai had himself affiliated to a *Vendita*[16] of the Carbonari at Macerta, and earlier still he had been enrolled among the Freemasons of Sinigaglia, where his name is entered upon the register of the lodge."[17] None the less if we accepted all the statements thus boldly put forward we should have to believe that Mastai had been initiated a Freemason half a dozen times over and in as many different places, which is not in itself likely. All the more keen then the desire among Masons themselves in their Masonic journals to produce unequivocal proof that the Head of the Church despite all his anathemas had been inconsistent enough to enroll himself at one time in their ranks.

Seemingly the earliest attempt to place the fact of Mastai's initiation beyond dispute was made in 1868. The *Monde Maçonnique* of Paris announced in February of that year that satisfactory evidence was forthcoming from Sicily which would

[16] Literally "sale"; this was the name given to reunions of the Carbonari.

[17] Lachâtre, *Histoire des Papes* (Edn. 1880), Vol. III, p. 351. The life of Pius IX is only found in this, the third edition.

be placed before their readers without delay. The promise was not redeemed until August when it appeared that the evidence, such as it was, though sent from Messina, referred not to Sicily but to Philadelphia in the United States. The account stated that Mastai "in the time of Gregory XVI" (sic) returning from a mission to Chile passed through Philadelphia and being there initiated as a Mason was most diligent in attending the lodges. On one occasion in particular he delivered a speech containing the following sentences: "In truth it is from you, my illustrious brothers, that I receive to-day the true light. I have been up to this in the most dense fog. I am entirely convinced that Freemasonry is one of the noblest associations known to the world and I am proud to have been admitted a member." The extravagance of all this was too glaring even for the readers of the *Monde Maçonnique*. The simple fact was that Mastai on returning from his mission to Chile in 1825, seven years before Gregory XVI was elected Pope, came straight back from South America without ever setting foot in the northern continent at all. In the end enquiries were made in Philadelphia itself with the result that the *Monde Maçonnique* in Feb. 1869 published the official replies received and declared itself satisfied that Pius IX had never been initiated as a Mason in Philadelphia. Other attempts to supply evidence followed, but all collapsed upon investigation. It would be futile to go into details, but one case perhaps merits special notice on account of the quite marvellous play of the imagination for which some individual must have been responsible.

Shortly after the death of Pius IX another Masonic journal of Paris, the *Chaîne d'Union*, in its number for April 1878, printed a long letter from M. Lebrun, an architect and a Freemason, whom the editor declared to be a man whose veracity was above suspicion.[18] M. Lebrun described how in the year 1865 he had been in intimate business relations with a certain M. Déforges who declared that he had been "godfather" to Pius IX on the occasion of his Masonic initiation. Pius IX was then, as he alleged, in a cavalry regiment serving under Napoleon and in garrison at Thionville. M. Déforges supplied

[18] He introduced him as "bon Franc-maçon et citoyen d'une honorabilité incontestable et incapable d'avancer un fait quelconque à la légère."

many details about the gay, not to say dissipated, life then led by Mastai. He further declared that after Mastai became Pope he (Déforges) paid him a visit at the Vatican and was well received. The Pope talked over old times with him and called him jocosely "mon petit lieutenant".

Needless to dwell upon the chronological and other difficulties which at once raised vehement suspicions as to the trustworthiness of this narrative. Search was made in the military archives and it was found that J. M. Mastai had never served in Napoleon's army. Ultimately in the number for October 1878 (p. 371) the editor of the *Chaîne d'Union* admitted in express terms that Mastai had never served in a French regiment and, to use his own words: "Consequently Count Mastai Ferretti never formed part of the garrison at Thionville. This is the best proof that he was never admitted as Mason in the lodge of this town."

We may pass over the photographs (sold in thousands) which by a process of more or less ingenious faking professed to be likenesses taken of Pius IX as a young Abbé dressed in soutane and rabbat, but wearing at the same time a Masonic scarf with all its distinctive emblems. The contrivers of this unscrupulous fraud had evidently forgotten that long before photography came into use for taking portraits Mastai had been consecrated Archbishop and consequently would never have worn the particular form of ecclesiastical costume in which he was represented, even if he had been so crazy as to have his portrait taken in such a guise. It is, however, only right to mention that the Masonic journal *Chaîne d'Union* in 1885 (p. 367) strongly protested against the sale of these bogus photographs, fully admitting at the same time that they had beyond all question been produced by fraudulent means.

With regard to Sinigaglia it may briefly be said that when Pius IX was a young man, there was no Masonic lodge at Sinigaglia. Finally we may note that shortly after the publication of Leo XIII's antimasonic Encyclical *Humanum genus* another attempt was made to produce documentary evidence which would prove that Pius IX had himself been a Freemason. In an article in the *Monde Maçonnique* of Paris in 1885 a M. Léon Bigot professed to print the text of the diploma given to John Mastai Ferretti by a Masonic lodge of the Scotch

rite at Palermo in the first fortnight of August 1839. The moment the document was printed its spuriousness was made manifest by a crowd of blunders and anachronisms which many of the Masonic fraternity were not slow to point out. Most glaring of all, in 1839 Mastai was Bishop of Imola (he was made Cardinal at the end of that same year), and his signatures in the registers and other official documents of the see showed that he had never quitted the town during the first fortnight of August when he was supposed to have been at Palermo. The forgery was completely and finally exposed in the rival Masonic journal the *Chaîne d'Union,* already mentioned, in a long article of 1 October 1885.

But the most remarkable and significant of all the happenings connected with the alleged Freemasonry of Pius IX was the "incident Floquet", as it may conveniently be called, which occurred when M. Floquet was President of the French Chamber of Deputies, on 11th December, 1891. A member of the Government, M. Fallières, then Minister of Justice and of Worship, was delivering a speech upon the pretended aggressiveness of the French episcopate. There was question of a certain admonitory circular calling the attention of the Bishops to this and that, when one of the deputies interpolated a taunting remark asking whether the circular had been previously submitted for approval to the heads of the French Freemasons. M. Fallières retorted that the question had nothing to do with Freemasonry, and a tremendous scene ensued of which the first phrases are thus recorded in the *Journal Officiel.*

The President (*M. Floquet*) *addressing the Right.*

Surely you cannot be unaware that Freemasonry has been fully authorised for years past. What is more, has numbered amongst its dignitaries many individuals who have belonged to your own party. (*Protests from the Right.* Hear, Hear, *from the Left.*)

M. Fallières. With your permission, gentlemen, I should like to say that this is a question upon which I can express no opinion, seeing that I myself am not a Freemason. (Uproar).

The President. Very well, I who am a Freemason—

M. le Comte de Bernis. I can't congratulate you—

The President.—am able to tell you that Freemasonry has long ago been authorised. You know it perfectly well, you gentlemen who are making all this disturbance (*Applause from the Left*).

M. le Comte de Bernis. Authorised by whom? By you I suppose.

The President. It has in particular been authorised by Pius IX, who belonged to that body (*Loud applause from all the benches on the Left and Centre. Protests on the Right*).

Monseigneur Freppel. That is untrue (*C'est faux*).

M. le Comte de Bernis. This is atrocious. It is an imposture. I defy you to prove it. (*Loud exclamation from the Left.*)

M. de Baudry d'Asson. It is abominable.

M. le Comte de Bernis. An unparalleled piece of insolence.

M. de Baudry d'Asson. It is an abominable lie.

M. le Comte de Bernis. Prove it. I defy you to prove what you have stated.

Mgr. Freppel. It is a calumny.

(Meanwhile round after round of applause is addressed to the President from the same benches.)

It is impossible to quote further; the scene was long protracted. The Right refused to allow the debate to proceed until the President explained his words. The President threatened penalties for obstruction and it seems characteristic of the methods of the Republican French Government that the first person to be "named", as we should say in English parliamentary procedure, was the Bishop of Angers, Mgr. Freppel, though to judge from the report, his attitude throughout had been perfectly correct and dignified. Member after member on the Right,—M. le Comte de Mun, M. Paul de Cassagnac, M. Provost de Launay, etc.—rose to his feet, called upon the President to substantiate his words and declared himself ready to be called to order. "It is you, M. le Président, who ought to be called to order," ejaculated the Baron de Mackau indignantly. Eventually some sort of hearing was accorded to M. Fernand de Ramel, who evidently spoke as an authority on procedure and who addressing himself to the President urged very forcibly:

> You have laid aside your character as President, you have taken part in the discussion and in accordance with the Standing Orders of the House you ought to leave the presidential chair and come down to the tribune to make your explanation.

These protests were not without effect. The President seems to have murmured something about being exasperated beyond endurance, and also named the *Grand Dictionnaire* of

Larousse as his authority for the statement made concerning Pius IX. That he could not have meant to insult the memory of Pius IX was, he declared, evident from the fact that he only attributed to him a quality which he was proud to claim for himself. This particular explanation was received with thunders of applause from the Left, but the futility of the logic is apparent when one reflects that by parity of reasoning it would be no libel for a married citizen to proclaim that the Pope had a wife and as many children as he had in his own family.

The inevitable result of such an incident was to revive the whole discussion. The old familiar stories were repeated, to be met with the same refutations. We are only concerned here to notice a challenge which in January 1892 was copied into several Italian newspapers and which had the effect of eliciting the following telegram addressed to the *Secolo* of Milan by Adriano Lemmi, Grand Master of the Italian Freemasons.

In consequence of the article which I read in No. 9252 of your Journal (7th Jan. 1892), and to put an end to further wild talk, I ask you to publish the following statement.

On the 12th of December last, the Chancery of the Grand Orient of France, telegraphed to me to ask if I possessed any documents showing that Pius IX had been a Mason. The Chancellor of the Grand Orient of Italy, by my direction, replied in the following terms.

It has constantly been rumoured that Pius IX had belonged either to the Carbonari or to the Freemasons, but no serious documentary evidence has yet been produced to show that he had been initiated in any of the Reunions (*Vendite*) [19] or Lodges of Italy.

In this way it will be seen that all the insinuations of clericals and renegades fall to the gound.

Adriano Lemmi, Grand Master of the Italian Freemasons.

By the "insinuations of clericals" Lemmi presumably means the suggestion that the Freemasons wished to claim Pius IX as a member of their body, although they were well aware that no evidence existed of his ever having joined them. Finally, to our thinking, the most satisfactory proof of all, if further evidence is needed, is the fact that three times over, the ques-

[19] *Vendite* (sales) as previously explained was the technical name of the meetings of the Carbonari. Such pretended "sales" were the natural occasions when charcoal burners would come together to discuss their secret purposes.

tion of the Freemasonry of Pius IX has been raised in the *Intermédiaire,* the French equivalent of the English weekly, *Notes and Queries.* The French journal, like the English, is read by a large number of literary people, interested in out-of-the-way scraps of information, and is rather anti-clerical in tone. On each occasion no serious attempt has been made to furnish evidence of the initiation of John Mastai. On the contrary, Freemasons of standing have written to declare that the discussions in Masonic journals had made the fact plain that no such evidence existed.

"It is now ten years", said a contributor, who described himself as a former member of the Council of the Grand Orient of France, "that this story has been in circulation and surely it is a surprising thing that not a single one of the Pope's contemporaries, (this was written in 1874 when Pius IX was still living) has come forward to say that he remembered meeting him in a Masonic lodge"; and then the writer goes on to describe in detail the utter collapse of every attempt to supply definite information.[20] To letters written to the *Intermédiaire* in this tone, practically no answer was attempted either on this or any subsequent occasion.[21] It does not seem too much to infer that this may be taken as a final answer to the question so much debated.

But even now this ridiculous calumny is still circulated. In 1922, there was published in London a pretentious work[22] by a certain "Dudley Wright", who is a contributor to English Masonic journals and who on the title page proclaims himself the author of several books dealing with Masonry. The numerous gross misprints and blunders which occur in the volume do not give a very favorable idea of the writer's level of education, but that does not prevent him from making many categorical statements as to matters of fact, which in almost every case are unsupported by any verifiable reference. After devoting some 40 pages to Pius IX's Allocution *Multiplices inter* (1865) against secret societies, Mr. Wright remarks:

But strange to say, there is no doubt that Pius IX was himself a Freemason. His signature still exists in the books of one of the

[20] See *L'Intermédiaire,* Vol. VII, p. 702. 10 Dec. 1874.
[21] See Vol. XVIII, (1885) pp. 322, 461, 492 and Vol. XXIV, (1891), p. 999.
[22] *Roman Catholicism and Freemasonry,* London, W. Rider, 1922.

Italian Lodges of Montevideo. Shortly after his ordination Mastai Ferretti was sent as Auditor to the Vicar-General of Chile, and at one time it was believed that he was initiated into Freemasonry in that country. When in later years he was appointed Apostolic Delegate in Uruguay, he appeared in the Lodges as a fully qualified Freemason, and a writer in the *Libertad del Pensamiento*, a Madrid journal, in 1870, said that there was in existence in the possession of one whose name he gave (Soussingeas) a portrait of the Pope in Masonic regalia. Quite recently (!!),[23] however, any doubt that may have existed on the question was put on one side by the discovery of the initiation of Pope Pius IX into Freemasonry in the Lodge Eterna Catena of Palermo on 15 August 1839." [24]

After which Mr. Wright professes to print not only a translation of the text of the entry in the register, but also that of the decree by which Mastai Ferretti "was expelled from the Order for perjury . . . the same being signed by Victor Emmanuel, King of Italy, and the Grand Master of the Orient of Italy". How it came about that Mastai who returned from South America in 1825 and never again left Italy, "appeared as a fully qualified Mason in the Lodges of Montevideo" but was nevertheless "initiated" at Palermo in 1839, the writer does not explain.

HERBERT THURSTON, S.J.

London, England.

PHYSICAL, SPIRITUAL AND SPIRIT COGNITION.

THE notion of spiritual life supposes conjunction of soul with the body: it is an activity of the whole man, body and soul, not of the soul alone. Spirit life is altogether different from spiritual life. The spiritual life is bodily life acting for the benefit of the spirit which is a human soul. Spiritual life presupposes the senses; it is impossible if the senses are excluded. When soul and body are separated spiritual life ceases in any particular subject. The spiritual life, then, is the highest moral life of the body, or of a soul in normal conjunction with a body.

[23] This "quite recently" gives an idea of Mr. Dudley Wright's trustworthiness. The Palermo story, as stated above, was exposed by the Masonic journal *Chaîne d'Union* in 1885.

[24] *Roman Catholicism and Freemasonry*, pp. 172-175.

The soul and the body have proper functions: the soul understands and wills, the body alone feels, say, pain, and similar physical conditions. There is no temperance, no purity, no strength of will except through the senses. We do not so much as pray except with the help of the senses. Our suffering is through the senses; even Christ's Agony in the Garden came to Him through His higher sensitive life.

The senses purely as such, however, do not perform the acts of the spiritual life: the animal life, the senses in us, must be raised to a higher activity and potentiality through the presence in us of a spiritual substance, the soul, and thus they acquire a new force which no mere brute can reach. These new powers are essentially sense-faculties elevated to a higher order by the soul. They are called technically the *vis cogitativa*. This *vis* or *facultas cogitativa* in man is known as the *vis aestimativa* in lower animals. It recognizes fundamentally what is useful or the opposite, helpful or the contrary. In man it is also called the *ratio particularis,* as it collates perceptions of individual objects; the intellect however collates universal perceptions.

By the *vis cogitativa* one can follow and appreciate fully an entire Beethoven sonata without for an instant using the intellect; it can, as has been said, judge of anything which contains no universal propositions. Our passions are in the region of the *vis cogitativa*. Sins of the mind against truth and established authority and sins against justice are of the higher powers of the soul and are always very grave, but sins of the *vis cogitativa* are usually venial.

Most of the poetry of the world is created by the sensitive faculty as elevated by the indwelling spirit of man and not by the mind as such. The imagination which has so much to do in the production of poetry is a sensitive and not a spiritual faculty, it is a part of the body not of the mind. The body as we said can produce all concrete thought, all thought which is not abstract, universal. Some great poets like Keats usually work with the *vis cogitativa* alone, others like Dante use the *vis cogitativa* and the higher spiritual intellect combined with it. Musicians, sculptors and painters do most of their work by the *vis cogitativa,* verbal artists are likely to go up to the intellectual plane at times. The theologian and philosopher act on an intellectual plane always.

The intellect while in the body gets all its cognition through the senses, *nihil est in intellectu quod non prius fuerit in sensu.* The senses supply the basis of cognition in a concrete form and the intellect abstracts from this basis the universal concept. Between death and the resurrection the soul works entirely without the senses because these senses are temporarily destroyed. They are to be recreated after the resurrection.

While the soul is separated from the body, is in a spirit state, it becomes conscious, through knowledge communicated to it by higher spirits, of many facts it did not know in its state of vital principle. It gets a knowledge of the whole material universe as if from a vast mountain overlooking the universe. It also becomes conscious of its own existence, it sees itself as it could not in life. In life the soul knows it exists only by laborious indirect reasoning on its own operations. Death holds a mirror to the soul in its new preternatural state, and its new knowledge is poured into it, infused by the superior angels, who radiate knowledge as the sun radiates light.

This knowledge poured into the separated soul by the higher spirits is a knowledge of universals lacking particular facts. A knowledge of facts of the spirit world requires supernatural privileges. Spirit happiness comes from a knowledge of particular facts. In life our happiness comes from a knowledge of particular facts obtained from the senses. After death our true happiness will come only after the reunion of the soul and the glorified body. In heaven even before the reunion with the body the cloud of the flesh defiled with sin will fall away and the soul will be in the spirit world where all is will and intellect. The angels constantly diffuse knowledge which is their activity. They exist in a sea of high and vast thought. Even the lost souls have this boundless knowledge but not unto joy. The saved will have privileges of grace, the lost will lack these privileges. Since the material world is in a lower order than that of the soul the soul will grasp, comprehend, the material world wholly. This is part of the wonderful nobility of a soul even if such a soul is depraved. It must be wonderful to call down the saving Blood of Calvary. That innate nobility of the soul means nothing for our good unless we work with the gifts offered us. God has no use for idlers except to point a moral.

Another important phase of the life of a soul is the connexion between it and suffering. While the soul is united with the body the soul itself is not capable of suffering. All our sufferings in life are bodily pains, have their seat in the upper or lower powers of the senses. Even when we suffer because the efforts of our wills are checked or defeated the grief or pain is not in our wills but in our senses. The will of man either acts or ceases to act, but in itself it cannot suffer. So-called soul-suffering, *passiones animales,* are depressing states of the higher appetitive senses, arising from intellectual perceptions of unpleasant facts. No intellectual act or volitive act can in itself cause suffering even when these are apprehensions of very unpleasant evil. What they offer to the intellect and will causes pain or pleasure in our senses. The spirit is above pain as far as it is above sensation.

Pain impedes the action of the spirit but the consequent pain is felt not by the spirit—it is in the senses alone. Suffering of the will is a metaphorical expression for the misery caused by sin. Sin is in discord with the harmony of the world and it causes shame. In spirits the greatest punishment and suffering consists in shame and in the struggle between the will and some fact which exists or is missing, *renisus voluntatis ad id quod est, vel non est.* This suffering, *dolor,* is of a kind not understood by us, and we use it because we have no term more exact. We do not comprehend spirit life and we have no terms of comparison; we are forced to fall back on the nearest approach we have to the spirit's will-activity which may be in opposition, discord, with itself and with no prospect of relief, hence we use the term *dolor.* How the simple acts of the spirit-will meeting with constant failure, discord, are suffering we do not know, but they are, and we are conscious of this more through faith than through philosophical proof.

God is beauty, harmony, love, and what is opposed to God is foulness, discord, uncharity. Hell-fire is materiality as opposed to the spirit-will, yet it is literally fire, but it does not burn chemically as it would act against the flesh. Water would be just as effective as fire. The demons although they are spirits actually suffer from hell-fire because God permits material fire to check them, destroy their freedom. No theologian holds that the fire of hell burns them as fire burns a

material object. What we say here of the demons holds true for damned human souls in the disembodied state. To say that a disembodied soul retains certain traces of its sensitive power and so is capable of suffering from fire is untrue, because if it were true there would be no reason why an animal could not be immortal.

Material elements check reprobate spirits by what is technically called *alligatio,* a binding, and this peculiar *alligatio* is the only manner matter can act on spirit. Spirits can not be bound literally in any manner by matter. Moreover, there must be a certain natural congenial relation between the capabilities of matter and spirit to effect this *alligatio* even miraculously. A stone may miraculously be made to rise in the air but it cannot be made even miraculously to think, since thinking is impossible to matter and implies contradiction. To restrain a spirit by matter is miraculous but not impossible and such detention is afflictive to the spirit. Dante uses this fact repeatedly in the Inferno: he binds Ephialtes with chains although Ephialtes piled Ossa on Olympus; Minos, King of Crete, the judge in Tartarus, is held fixed with rage, the Minotaur also is held by rage. The suicides are bound in the shapes of trees, Capaneus lies still under the rain of fire, bound by pride, Brunetto Latini's punishment is in part that he cannot leave his mob.

The angels are pure spirits; they have nothing material in their natures. *Qui facit angelos suos spiritus.* It is necessary that the universe be assimilated to God who acts by intellect and will, and thus there must be creatures who act by intellect and will alone. The angels are in countless billions because they must represent through a distinction of forms, each one a separate perfection of God. Angels are not grouped in different species because species differ through matter; they are also incorruptible because they lack matter which is the seed of death. When the angel Raphael was with Tobias the angel moved the body he had assumed and with which he could speak, but Raphael himself did not feel or do any bodily act.

Angels and disembodied souls are in places only by a virtual contact. The soul is in our body as a container not as contained. It is more exact to say that our bodies are in our souls than that our souls are in our bodies—a soul cannot be con-

tained in a physical space. Spirits, too, can move locally but not as bodies move. In a physical motion the body moves from part to part of the *continuum* of motion in which it happens to be, it is successively in part after part of this *continuum,* but a spirit cannot be so divided. The spirit must move by its virtue, influence, the body by its substance. Heaven, Hell and Purgatory are places but more literally conditions. They are not up or down but are conditions. We are so tied up to sense that our celestial geography is as topsy-turvy as an Irish map where North is down and South is up.

AUSTIN O'MALLEY, M.D.

Philadelphia, Pa.

THE SACRIFICE OF THE NEW LAW.

IN the November (1926) issue of your excellent monthly, Dr. Alexander MacDonald deals with my recent book *The Sacrifice of the New Law.* In justice to the public, and in the cause of truth, one is forced to speak courteously, yet forcibly, with what seems both an unscientific and unfair criticism of a new book.

All who read the book will, I think, attest that it states honestly the doctrine of Dr. MacDonald in his recent work *The Sacrifice of the Mass.* His theory and reasonings are given in his own words together with his interpretations of St. Thomas. They are then carefully and courteously examined. Where his theory and reasonings are found faulty, or where the author deems them an honest though mistaken interpretation of St. Thomas, strong arguments are brought forward for their refutation or rejection. Yet in his criticism of my book the writer neither mentions nor tries to answer any of these arguments. He states in an inadequate and erroneous way certain teachings of *The Sacrifice of the New Law,* and his only answer practically to objections is to repeat over and over again what has already been stated in his book or writings, statements too, that such a distinguished writer ought very well to know, are considered by many learned and able theologians very far from proven—if indeed not quite erroneous.

Theological science and truth are not helped by a repetition of such statements. Without a reasonable and convincing

refutation of the strong arguments which support them the opinions of opponents are not dislodged nor may a reviewer state or imply that they are dislodged. After all in a matter of free scientific discussion where the Church has given no decision or command, it is the force of solid scientific argument that counts and not a mere appeal to authority—for clearly here, there is no authority. Hence in reviewing a new book to give the general public, in open questions, not its arguments, but a condemnation without a hearing, is—I think—universally allowed to be unfair.

When it is stated, "The Supper is a complete sacrifice, not in virtue of a mystic immolation or a moral immolation of the Victim but as being a 'relative mode' of the Sacrifice of Calvary, or the 'sacramental' expression thereof" (p. 548), one must consider this an inadequate exposition of the doctrine in *The Sacrifice of the New Law,* where it is expressly stated—

> In this book immolation is always sacrificially "real" and always sacrificially mystic (p. 172).

The criticism does not explain what is meant by "mystical" and what is meant by "immolation" as set forth in the new book. Hence the general reader, attaching to these words the ambiguous meanings that are current, must either depart mystified or else with quite an erroneous idea of what is really taught.

Had the reader been told that "mystic" signified the spiritual power of the priest,

> (1) Authoritatively to make his action valid for mankind,
> (2) To make the Victim contain and offer all—or according to the sacrifice, some of—the supreme reverence, worship, adoration, etc., of the Cross,
> (3) To regulate the Victim's outward expression of these that they might be expressed just and just only, after the manner God commanded or approved:

had the reader been further told, that to immolate does not necessarily mean to destroy, but rather according to the mode of expression divinely approved or commanded for that particular sacrifice, to make the victim then and there that outward sacrifice; then the travesty and misrepresentation of the

doctrine of *The Sacrifice of the New Law* contained in the above-mentioned quotation could never have been penned. One could then easily grasp the meaning of the teaching, that the Supper was really the whole Cross, with the same Victim, the same inner sacrifice, and the same relations of both to God, expressing themselves outwardly, according to God's command or approval, in the Eucharistic Sacramental mode.

As the Eucharistic mode is figurative of the Cross mode, and must be referred thereto to express what it signifies, the reason also why it is called a "relative mode" ought to be at once evident. Personally I should be glad to hear that the expression "relative mode" were banished from theology and "representative mode" put in its stead. For as "representative" implies not only a sufficient likeness to, but also a participation more or less complete of, the fruits of the Cross[1]—much misunderstanding would thus be removed.

Notwithstanding the fact, that in the new book very strong arguments are used against the view that destruction is essential to sacrifice (pp. 47 ff.), Dr. MacDonald merely passes them by, just remarking, "In vain will you cite against this the case of Melchisedech, for we know not how his sacrifice was offered; or that of the emissary goat, for whatever became of it when sent into the wilderness, the other goat offered at the same time was certainly 'slain for God'" (p. 548). Here again, there is the tacit assumption that destruction is essential to sacrifice (Dr. MacDonald's own view) and that the interpretation of Sacred Scripture that makes destruction essential to sacrifice is the correct and therefore the only interpretation. Hence without any further discussion, the opposite opinion is assigned a "black mark". Needless to say, Dr. MacDonald's view is worth no more than the arguments which uphold it. One cannot see very much save an evasion of the difficulties of Scripture in the remarks he makes about the sacrifice of Melchisedech and that of the emissary goat. Nor does he attempt to face the solid reasoning and the weighty arguments, which forced one to relinquish the "essential-destruction" theory of sacrifice, from an honest examination of Sacred Scripture and of the doctrine of St. Thomas in *The Sacrifice of the New Law* (pp. 48ff.).

[1] *Summa*, III, Q. 83, Art. 1, C.

True, most of us were taught in the Seminary that destruction was essential to sacrifice. But personally my experience is, that neither professors nor taught were in the least satisfied with the theory. As far as one could learn the opinions of others hereon, when it came to the Sacrifice of the Mass, I think, Fr. Otten pretty well summed up that opinion in the words—speaking of the various shades of the destruction theory with other opinions: "Besides these views, there are many others, but they contribute little towards clearing up the mystery".[2]

Not all arguments against the essential-destruction theory of sacrifice are given in the new book, nor indeed are those set down fully developed. The book was purposely made as brief as possible, and strictly confined to essentials. Hence something further may now be added by way of elucidation and confirmation. *The Sacrifice of the New Law* sums up the discussion thus:

> Does Consecration by the priest always employ the destruction of the victim? No—A sufficient indication, in the rite and in the victim, of the actual destruction of the Cross? Yes (p. 61).

Hence a sufficient indication of the actual sufferings of the Cross is essential to every true sacrifice. This indication may be found either in the destruction of the victim or without such destruction, by so relating the victim to the rite which then and there obtains, as through this relation to make both sufficiently indicate the Cross. Hence it is not correct to state as the reviewer does that—

> The three writers above named, [Fr. Swaby, O.P., Abbot Vonier and myself] in their explanation of the Sacrifice offered in the Supper, leave it [the element of destruction] out altogether.

It is true that they do not make "actual destruction" an essential element of the Supper Sacrifice, yet they do maintain that the Supper sufficiently represents the death of Christ on the Cross.

Destruction entered sacrifice because of sin. Man, who is essentially, willy-nilly, related to God, ought freely to acknowledge, and to dispose all his thoughts, words and deeds to God,

[2] *History of Dogma,* Vol. II, p. 503.

as man's first beginning and last end. Clearly sin upsets this ordination. It denies efficiently this excellence of God and makes some creature man's last end. That is to say it tries to make some creature a god—a false god—and make man the sinner a kind of greater false god. The destruction of these false gods is the most efficient refutation of their claims. It also, if it is an act of worship, makes manifest what ought to be the proper ordination of man's mind to God. Destruction therefore is here a means to an end. It is a manner of proclaiming the superexcellence of God. It therefore serves in sacrifice a twofold purpose according to St. Thomas. "Through sacrifices, the regulation (ordinatio) of the mind to God is represented, and to this those offering sacrifice are excited. . . . In this way also men are drawn away from sacrificing to idols."[3] However, as the sacrifice, because of God's infinite mercy, is His divinely chosen way of human redemption, and of man's restoration to God's friendship, it follows that God cannot leave man in the destruction which sin deserves and brings upon man.

Hence a sacrifice of redemption will manifest a very much more exalted attribute of God, than that which, humanly speaking, is merely required to destroy the sinner and his false gods.

Due sacrifice will show the Supereminent God, changing destruction into victory, changing death into life, misery into happiness, etc. Now, clearly as sacrifice is the highest worship of God, it will consist not in manifesting God's power to destroy, but in manifesting God's power to change death into life, sin into virtue, and the thraldom and subserviency to a false god into the freedom and happiness of friendship and even sonship with the only true God.

Here then destruction may in some way be a "conditio sine qua non", but it cannot be an essential of sacrifice. It seems incongruous, where there is this death or destruction—as we know obtains in the case of the sinner—to think that God must first have caused it before He might manifest His supreme excellence by stooping down and changing it into life and happiness. Yet it does not seem in the least incongruous, that God would permit man to cause this death, as a means unto the

[3] I, II, Q. 102, Art. 3, C.

manifestation of a peculiarly divine supereminence to the world. As man is free and may here act freely, it is not incongruous that the sinner following sin and working according to the nature or dictates of sin, should bring death, destruction and woe upon himself and others. Thus the sinner would realize that sin achieves only ultimate woe, destruction and death; that its nature is not to exalt but to destroy. Being conscious that it was his own free work, while contradicting the command of God, the sinner would feelingly know that he deserved the consequences sin brought upon him: that he deserved death, woe and unending misery, while at the same time he would experience the truth of God's word that "the wages of sin is death". His natural craving for relief and happiness would thus induce him to loathe sin, to strive to get rid of it, and humbling himself to return to God. Indeed the effects of wilful sin seen in others, whether as due to his wickedness or to their own, would work powerfully at times to this same end—even more powerfully than when experienced in himself. The eminence of God and His inexorable truth and justice allowing and not preventing these evils would thus be brought home more convincingly to the sinner, together with his own helplessness to devise or effect a remedy. When then, God stooped down and offered a remedy, naturally the sinner from his experience, would be the better disposed gratefully and appreciatively to accept it and gratefully and appreciatively to fulfil the conditions imposed for its acceptance. From all this it seems very reasonable to conclude, that as man's free sin is the cause of destruction, so it is the sinner who works destruction and death. Thus we find it was the sinner who killed Abel, and it was sinners who killed Christ. We are able also, to see the Provident Mercy of God, who permits the sinner himself to work out the destruction due to sin in himself and in others—and we are able to grasp more clearly God's omnipotent mercy which draws good out of evil, life out of death, happiness out of woe. Only God can raise the dead to life, forgive and supernaturalize the sinner, etc. Hence even in sacrifice, it would seem that it is the sinner freely destroys the victim and if the priest ever does so, he does so not as priest but as sinner. Thus when with the progress of time the notion of sacrifice becomes clearer in Sacred Scripture this is the teaching that seems to emerge.

The Chief Priest did not always actually kill the victim but he always took and offered the blood. The sinner placed his hands on the victim, then either he himself, the Chief Priest or one of the assistant priests or levites, actually slew the victim. In the most perfect type of sacrifice, the holocaust, the man who offered the male victim of oxen or sheep slew the victim. "He shall put his hand upon the head of the victim . . . and he shall immolate the calf before the Lord and the priests, the sons of Aaron, shall offer the blood thereof" (Lev. 1:4-5).

As far as I have been able to discover, the present-day custom in the East, with reference to the Paschal Lamb, is that in the evening two men bring the Lamb; one of them *kills* it. Then the priest takes and offers the blood. Now as one who is not a priest kills the victim even in the highest type of Old Law sacrifice, the irrevocable conclusion seems to follow, that killing and destruction are not essentially a priestly action even in sacrifice, and are not therefore a portion of the essence of sacrifice. The priestly action seems to be the free acceptance of this destruction into the victim, and the offering and sprinkling of the blood. When the sinner gave and slew the victim, clearly he thereby lost possession of it forever. As the victim was in place of himself, its life in place of his, the sinner sufficiently manifested thus, that because of sin his own life was forfeit, that he deserved death, and was willing to endure death to destroy and make reparation for his sins. The destruction of the victim was a sign which outwardly indicated these dispositions of the sinner. If the priest actually killed the victim, it seems clear that he did so as a sinner, in the sinner's place, to manifest these dispositions. For sacrificial death occurs, that the sinner may live, although sin makes him die and makes him deserve to die. Practically the fact that the sinner himself lives may be taken as an expression of his hope to live, and of his appeal for God's aid whereby he hopes to live.

"The destruction of sins is signified by the killing of animals. Now as men deserved death because of their sins, so when in their stead these animals were killed, thereby an expiation of sin was signified".[4] Now granting that the sinner once killed the

[4] *Summa*, I-II, Q. 102, Art 3, 5.

victim at any time past, present or future, there seems no sufficient reason why, with God's approval, the priest should not express the fact and the disposition which inspired it, not by the actual death of the victim but by an approved representation thereof. Although the elements discussed are not separated actually in sacrifice, for the sake of clearness, one may be pardoned if a separation be made. So far, we have reached the immediate preparation required, that the priest as priest may offer the sacrifice. The priest now accepts from the destructive action of the sinner, or from the representation of the destruction wrought by the sinner, such sufferings or such representations of these sufferings only, as God approves of or commands, when the life of the victim is offered up to proclaim God's unique and supereminent Lordship as first beginning and last end. Here the priest as mediator, as giver of good gifts, holds the position of friend both of God and man. (Incidentally the reason may be noted why a priest should be holy, why the love of God and of man should be paramount in his soul, why ordinary priests must act in some way in the name and authority of Christ). Clearly the perfect obedience to commands, the appreciative love of God and man, the utter abhorrence and detestation of sin and its consequences, etc., which the priest has in his soul, and which he expresses while offering, through the accepted sufferings or accepted representation of suffering in the victim, this victim and its life to God, in token of supreme reverence to God and of friendship to God and to man, for placation, conciliation and peace, will give worth and excellence to his sacrifice. We know that Christ and Christ alone as priest and victim did this perfectly and superabundantly; with a superabundant efficiency and effect. One may now grasp, why the priest accepted the sufferings (or representation of the sufferings) into the victim in order to offer the blood. For the blood signified "life"; and in sacrifice, that such life sprang from and was subject to God, as first cause and last end. Hence in the Old Law, the blood was not destroyed, but offered and sprinkled on the altar, and what then remained over was poured out at the foot thereof. (Leviticus 1 : 5, 5 : 9.) St. Thomas therefore writes,

A third part (of the victim in a *hostia pacifica*) was given unto the use of the offerers to show that man's salvation proceeds from God,

through the direction of God's ministers and man's own coöperation. . . . It was generally observed however that the blood and fat were not allotted to the use of the priests nor the offerers. The blood was poured over the horns and base of the altar (*Crepidinem Altaris*) to God's honor. . . . One reason for this was to exclude idolatry, for idolators used to drink the blood of the victim. . . . A third reason was because of divine reverence; for blood is especially necessary to life, and life (or the soul) is therefore said to be in the blood.[5]

The reader may easily work out how this theory applies to the Passion. Christ accepted such destruction on the Cross as His Father enjoined. This destruction was actually inflicted by sinners. Were the actual infliction of this destruction a necessary portion of the priest's duty, then sinners on Calvary could only kill Christ as His commissioned agents—an abhorrent idea, etc.

From what has been said—unfortunately one had to be prolix—it ought to be clear that destruction may or may not be employed in sacrifice: that it is a necessary condition, even as the fall was a necessary condition, of redemption; but that it is really not of the very essence itself of sacrifice. It ought to be clear also that the doctrine of *The Sacrifice of the New Law* does not exclude destruction from its explanation of sacrifice but assigns it, what seems, its due and proper place. It will also be allowed, I think, that the opinion expressed by the reviewer, although supported by many, is very far from proven and that the "black mark" assigned to the teaching of *The Sacrifice of the New Law* is far from deserved.

The reviewer next accuses *The Sacrifice of the New Law* of separating the Supper and the Cross.

It was inevitable that anyone attempting to separate the two, and make the Supper a sacrifice complete in itself, as the author of this book does, should come to grief. If the Supper were a complete sacrifice, it being Our Lord's offering for the sins of the world, the world would then and there have been redeemed, and the Sacrifice of the Cross would have been superfluous. Again, if there was a complete sacrifice in the Supper, and a complete sacrifice on Calvary, were there not two sacrifices? (p. 550-).

The Sacrifice of the New Law over and over again em-

[5] *Summa*, I-II, Q. 102, Art. 3 ad 8.

phatically declares that "the Supper and the Cross" are identically and completely one and the same sacrifice.

> It is identical with the Cross in everything save in the outward mode of offering and expression (p. 255).

How a reviewer can interpret this as a "separation" requires serious explanation. Further, since, to put it in simple language, the whole Cross gives itself in the Supper, the outward manner of physical suffering and actual death alone being excepted, it follows that not only is there but one sacrifice, but also that in its Eucharistic expression even as in its Cross expression, this one sacrifice is complete.

The Supper gives nothing to the Cross. This seems the constant teaching of tradition and of the Fathers and theologians of the Church before and after Trent. This view harmonizes what seems contradictory, and removes the difficulties on the way even as truth ever does.

The reviewer writes—

> The author of this book says he is following Catholic tradition. That is precisely what he is not doing. He is but trying to bolster up the idea first broached by a handful of theologians and bishops at the Council of Trent that there was a complete sacrifice in the Supper. It is true that this idea or theory has since had great vogue in the schools; but so far from being in accord with Catholic tradition, it runs directly counter to it. Catholic tradition makes Holy Mass the continuation of the Sacrifice of Calvary; this view makes it a continuation of a complete sacrifice that IS SUPPOSED [sic] to have been offered in the Supper; a complete sacrifice which has to be OTHER THAN THE SACRIFICE OF CALVARY [sic], else is the Sacrifice of Calvary the complete sacrifice that is offered in the Supper? (pp. 550-551).

Had the reviewer here stated that "the author of this book" ran directly counter to Dr. MacDonald's interpretation of tradition and to Dr. MacDonald's interpretation of most of the theologians and bishops at the Council of Trent—one would consider that the reviewer had a perfect right to his own opinion. When, however, Dr. MacDonald makes his interpretation the actual teaching of tradition, of theologians and bishops—a handful excepted—and then proceeds to stigmatize the teaching of *The Sacrifice of the New Law* and "the idea

or theory that since (Trent) had a good vogue in the schools" as running "directly counter" to Catholic tradition, one must be forgiven for protesting that Dr. MacDonald has no power to make such a statement, and that the more so, since it is based on an unproven, and it seems to me and others, an unprovable hypothesis. It is interesting to note that of the 157 prelates who discussed this subject at Trent, 102 gave no sufficient indication of their teaching, while of those who did speak, the opinions of two were ruled out. Of the remainder, that of 12 at least favors the opinion expressed in the new book: and that of "43 affirmed in terms or equivalently that our Lord offered in the Supper the Sacrifice He consummated on the Cross, and that the Supper and the Cross are therefore one and the same Sacrifice".[6]

When it is remembered that the opinion of these 43 is quite as capable of the interpretation required by the teaching of the new book, (to me and others it seems at least the better interpretation) as of the interpretation which Dr. MacDonald puts upon it, one can easily see what an open question this is, and how unauthoritative and how scientifically unsound is any condemnation launched on this head.

The reviewer continues—

> It is worth while bringing this point out clearly, for it clinches the matter. If the sacrifice offered in the Supper was complete, it could not have been the Sacrifice of Calvary, for that was completed on the Cross. How then can the Mass be the continuation of the Sacrifice of Calvary, seeing that we offer in the Mass what our Lord first offered in the Supper? (p. 551).

In the view of Dr. MacDonald, who maintains that the Supper itself is not a sacrifice, this difficulty seems unanswerable. Yet in the teaching of *The Sacrifice of the New Law* the answer seems simple enough. (Pp. 116-121 and 140.) Surely it is Christ Himself, with His fulness of grace and of virtue, that is so very pleasing to God? Christ's love for God and man, and the virtues whereby in His soul, He made that love bear an obedient and adequate relation to God and man, could not change. Christ loved the Father therefore, and loved man quite as much in the first instant of the Incarnation

[6] Dr. MacDonald's paper, ECCL. REVIEW, April 1926, p. 345.

as He did on the Cross. The supreme reverence, love, obedience, superabundant sorrow for the sin of the world, etc., of His beloved Son, God knew perfectly and therefore had no need that they be outwardly expressed. Neither had Christ as far as He Himself was concerned, any need of their outward expression—for this could not increase His devotion, love or virtues, nor indeed God's love and friendship toward him. Man however did require their outward expression, before he could know them. As Christ became man "propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem," mankind required such an outward expression of them as would effect the salvation of the world: and therefore such an expression of them, as would not merely make them known, but also convince mankind even in human fashion—grace, of course, was never without its efficiency—of their genuineness and so rouse mankind to accept and believe Christ and coöperate with and avail of the redemption and salvation He was giving them. This then was a primary function of the outward sacrifice—which God needed not and yet which He wished to be offered because of man and of man's salvation. Now the crowning human proof (the most excellent man can have, and the most convincing) of the genuineness of Christ's love for God and man was His willing death on the Cross. This, humanly speaking, gave to all other representations of Christ's love a power and worth—as far as man is judge—which they could not themselves possess. This does not mean that these manifestations did not adequately convey the one and unchangeable, genuine love of Christ. They undoubtedly contained it and conveyed it; yet mankind required further proof of this, ere men generally would accept it. Hence it seems quite clear, why the Divine wisdom attached salvation to the outward Cross—expression of Christ's Sacrifice. The essential working-out of reparation for sin, of supreme reverence, etc., does not concern the present discussion. Still, it ought to be evident that it was the Cross which gave force and worth to all representation of Christ's Love—as far as man is concerned—and not these representations that gave any force to the Cross. These the Cross therefore perfected and consummated. Now apply all this to the Supper.

That the Supper contained Christ Himself, His unchangeable love, His unchangeable sorrow and detestation of sin, etc.,

cannot, I think, be doubted. That Christ as priest and victim, adequately expressed all this, by the double consecration, the one of His Body, the other of His Blood, which is sacrificially set forth as being poured out, cannot I think be doubted.

That in the Supper, the expression of what it contained, and of what it was here and now doing, both contained also and expressed also an appeal to men, to recall to mind, and to realize the force of a great fact—the Cross—which proves the genuineness of representation of what is here and now—cannot, I think, be doubted.

What follows from all this?

That in the Supper we have the same Christ, priest and victim: the same love, reverence, inner sacrifice with its relations to God. That the Eucharist Supper is all this and that it is at present being offered to God for the salvation of the world, men have a sufficient proof both as to the fact and its genuineness, in the rite that expresses it, and in the appeal that rite makes to the Cross. We have therefore here a complete sacrifice sufficiently expressed outwardly. Whence come its merits? From the Heart of Jesus, the God-man, who from the very first instant of the Incarnation, because of Himself and of His inner sacrifice, inwardly merited the salvation of the world. St. Thomas says:

> From the beginning of His conception Christ merited for us eternal salvation.[7]

Outwardly according to the Father's will, Christ as priest and victim containing this inner sacrifice with its due relations to God, gives Himself and all to God, in supreme reverence by the Cross, and through the Cross expresses all to men, thereby making available and pouring out upon the world, all His merits. According to the Father's will the Cross does this of itself, speaking through itself—absolutely. According to the Father's will, the Cross does this also in the same act of supreme worship, and with all its merits, not speaking through the physical sufferings (actually present) of the Passion but by a sufficient representation of them—in the Eucharist. According to the Father's will, the Cross does this, not with all its worship and reverence, but with a certain participa-

[7] *Summa*, III, Q. 48, Art. 1, 2.

tion and expression of them in the other Sacraments. Thus the Supper, even as St. Thomas says of Baptism, before the Passion has "its power of justifying from Christ Himself, by whose power the very Passion itself was salutiferous".[8]

Christ therefore from the first instant of the Incarnation is the "hostia perpetua"—always containing the inner sacrifice of redemption with its fruits. As priest, showing that He freely accepts, according to His Father's will, the destruction sin deals out to His human nature, He offers Himself as victim with His inner sacrifice bearing the divinely decreed relations to God and man, through His Passion on the Cross, while outwardly tendering supreme worship to God. As Priest, He offers the very same Victim, with the very same inward sacrifice bearing the very same relations to God and man, through the double Consecration which by its likeness and appeal to the Cross, shows sufficiently to men, that He is now sacrificially tendering to God the very same supreme worship as the Cross. Hence there is only one and the same sacrifice, contained and outwardly functioning under two different modes: the one absolute or the Cross; the other representative or showing its genuineness and truth through the Cross. Each mode adequately and sufficiently expresses the complete sacrifice which it contains and offers. Hence the Supper is a complete sacrifice even as the Cross is a complete sacrifice.

Finally the definition of the Schema of Trent (1552): "Now it is clear that an external thing consecrated by the mystical operation of a priest and offered to God has rightly been called a Sacrifice," we are told was set aside in the session of 17 September, 1562. "And rightly was this definition set aside. THOSE WHO FRAMED IT, APPARENTLY OVERLOOKED THE FACT THAT GOD HIMSELF HAS REVEALED TO US WHAT IS TO BE OFFERED IN SACRIFICE AND HOW" (p. 552). To begin with, let it first be said that *The Sacrifice of the New Law* points out and proves that the "Consecration" here is special and peculiar—Sacrificial Consecration—and that the external thing must have God's approval or command. To state, as the reviewer does, without any reference to the text or context, "so you can prove to be a sacrifice any external thing which a priest may mystically consecrate and offer to God" (ibid.), is both to

[8] *Summa*, III, Q. 66, Art. 2, 1.

misrepresent and to falsify. Now what of the Schema Reformatum (1552)? The Council explicitly ruled out and rejected false teachings e. g., that of Bishop Bartholomew, O.P., who denied that the Supper was a propitiatory sacrifice; that of Bishop Thomas Cassellus, who held that Christ exercised the Aaronic priesthood on the Cross, etc. Yet the definition above given was never ruled out. Later on it was decided to leave open whether or not the Supper was a complete sacrifice and to omit anything that might be a barrier to the Reformer's return to the Church. Since even the reviewer admits, "of course you can prove the Supper to be a complete sacrifice by this definition" (p. 552), naturally for reasons of expediency, and because it might be a possible obstacle to the purpose in hand, the Fathers at Trent rightly omitted it. Hence not because "the element of destruction does not appear at all" or because it was deemed erroneous, was this definition set aside, but simply for reasons of expediency and prudence. For the reviewer's opinion and for his statement about those "who framed the definition" one has been unable to find any solid convincing historical or theological argument. As this paper is already very long—other remarks are omitted. From what has been said, the solution of other difficulties proposed ought not to require much thought from any intelligent reader.

One was anxious by *The Sacrifice of the New Law* to enlist the earnest thought of the best theologians and of the ablest minds, as an aid to the better understanding and to the promotion of greater love and greater devotion to this most Holy Sacrament and Sacrifice. This purpose seemed seriously impeded both by the mistaken views imputed by the learned reviewer to the new book, and by his unfair criticism and unproven statements—statements that set down as dogma, what after all, are merely views and opinions with a fairly good substantial backing. One was thus, with a certain amount of reluctance, compelled to make this reply both in justice to the cause and in defence of *The Sacrifice of the New Law*.

JOSEPH BRODIE BROSNAN

Rochdale, England.

THE ARCHBISHOP'S POCKET-BOOK.

XIX. Holy Poverty.

IT was understood in the cathedral household that, if nuns called to see the Archbishop, they were neither to be delayed unnecessarily nor to be told that His Grace could not see them. If the prelate were absent at the time, Father Martin, the vicar general, would attend to their business and duly report to his superior.

There were two reasons for this preference. Religious, even if they are mendicants, live according to a fixed rule. Their service to each other and to their charges, in school, hospital, orphanage, or in any other institution to which they are attached, makes time and punctuality on their part and in their behalf as essential a factor of charity and order, as it would be in the case of a physician on his way to a patient who suffers, or to a company of soldiers on active duty in the defence of their country.

Explicit instructions were accordingly given and enforced in connexion with the appointments of chaplains to convents, hospitals, asylums, and scholastic institutes in which sisters or brothers were engaged. Certain notes in the Archbishop's pocket-book, distinct from the regular reports on occasion of episcopal visitations of parishes, indicated that he had made it a point to ascertain from the superiors of houses to which parochial chaplaincies were attached, a conscientious answer to inquiries about the regular and punctual service rendered by the local clergy.

It is not the right or privilege of the mother superior or the administrator of a religious house to overlook neglects in spiritual service affecting the entire community. A careless and irregular chaplain, although otherwise efficient, good-natured or gifted, and however acceptable he may be in the eyes of the Reverend Mother, is apt to provoke criticism among the members of the religious household depending on his ministrations. Unconsciously he causes neglects on the part of members who, in order to meet their engagements in school, infirmary, visitation and domestic appointments, have thus to accommodate or readjust their routine duties, otherwise closely regulated, to suit the uncertainty and dilatoriness of one whom

they must otherwise revere. The man who relies upon his priestly prerogatives as an excuse for inconveniencing those under his charge, even when they cannot or will not complain, is hardly a trustworthy shepherd. Such were the well known views of the Archbishop.

Instances had occurred where the expected promotion of an assistant, who was known to be capable and popular, had been ignored by His Grace, despite the recommendation of the diocesan consultors. The secret of the archiepiscopal obstinacy might have been gleaned from personal entries in the old pocket-book. But even the wise Mr. Burns, guardian angel of that important wallet, found himself puzzled when he saw after the names of certain young Fathers, whom he knew to be probable candidates for rectorship, crosses or cryptic marks that proved a mystery to his occasional habits of literary study in the archiepiscopal library.

A second motive, distinct from that of preserving regular order in the religious organizations throughout the diocese, as a provincial camp of the Church militant, arose from the reverence which, His Grace felt, was due to the spouses of Christ. That reverence differed in character from the honor paid to the priesthood, though it called for no less consideration.

"A husband," he would say, "does not forfeit the superior position of his manhood by allowing precedence to his wife. Christ showed a manifest choice which placed the holy women at times even over the Apostles. Thus, when, after His Resurrection, He bade them "go and tell the Apostles and Peter" to meet Him in Galilee, He might have spoken directly to the future head of the Church who was to be His Vicar on earth; or also to the Beloved Disciple, St. John, who had rested on His Sacred Heart, and on that very morning of the Resurrection hastened to the sepulchre in his eagerness to see the Lord. But the Master did not do so on the important occasion of His first apostolic message."

The pronounced friendship of Christ for Martha and Mary, the two earliest members of an active and a contemplative or penitential order in the Christian Church, aside of His affection for Lazarus, at Bethany, suggests certain qualities of womanhood which lead to holiness through the heart rather than through the head. Man exercises power by manifesta-

tion of strength, or by calculation and virile leadership; but woman draws by an influence which acts more subtly and swiftly. She possesses tact and executive ability which make her superior in domestic management. The folly of popular female demagogues who, in order to obtain equal recognition in spheres of masculine activity, abandon the privileges of their station which raise them to a much higher level of influence, was a frequent theme of address at young women's conferences by the Archbishop. He recognized the full possibilities of extending this influence to fields of public as well as private activity, hitherto ignored in communities where the home was regarded as the ideal of civilized society; but he would not encourage the mannish type of female preachers who clamored for equality by sacrificing their superiority in the qualities of the heart.

He had many ways of his own of encouraging religious, particularly in the outlying districts where they taught the parish schools and had to live in small groups under sundry difficulties, while serving the cause of charity among the faithful. He would gather them around him in the community room at their recreation and get to know their individual tasks, their little difficulties and peculiarities, providing for them what they needed or might wish in the way of books for their library and furnishings for the school room. He seemed to see for himself, without anyone suggesting it, what was wanted or what would please them, and after he left the superior might often find a generous bank note beneath the table cover where he had sat while talking to them. At other times they would be surprised after his visit by the arrival of a beautiful statue for their little community chapel, or some useful article which his observant eye had missed and which he thought likely to give them help or pleasure. Thus the religious communities all had for their Archbishop not only a great reverence but a personal love which kept his image alive among them even when they found it hard to get a photograph of him for their parlors.

A report had recently come to His Grace that two strange nuns were making the rounds of the city, soliciting alms for an educational establishment abroad. They had sought hos-

pitality in a well known convent whose superior took for granted that they were authorized, as they had documents with seals and signatures, and had spoken of visiting the Ordinary of the diocese. The routine duties of the community members and a natural delicacy respecting the business of religious guests prevented the mother of the convent from inquiring about the activity of the two visitors, who were out of the house for the greater part of the time. After a while a note arrived from the chancellor inquiring about the authorization of the strangers to collect within the diocese. This led the two nuns to report at the cathedral for the purpose of making their excuses.

Contrary to his custom, the Archbishop had his secretary interview the two religious when they paid their visit. They were asked for their credentials, which were at once placed in the hands of His Grace, while the nuns were being questioned as to their work, the time they had spent in the city, and their intentions in the near future.

It turned out that their superior abroad had undertaken to build an academy for the education of little boys of the better class of families. The ordinary work of these religious, according to the constitution of their institute, was to instruct the ignorant, to nurse the sick, and to care for orphans. This they meant of course to do, but it required money. To obtain the latter the superior had thought of enlarging the sphere of their educational activity and of adding to its efficiency by a school not only for girls but for little boys whose guardians could afford to send them as boarders. The new building had put the community in debt, and hence the efforts to collect funds in America. It was hoped in this way to make the new institution pay for itself and to sustain certain other charitable enterprises which the order should like to embark upon.

When they had told their story to the secretary he left them; saying that His Grace would see them in a little while.

The Archbishop returned to them their letters of recommendation, which consisted of a Roman cardinal's approbation of the work of the institute. This was addressed to a former mother superior. There was also a note from the Auxiliary of their present Ordinary, stating that they were deserving objects of charity and that he personally commended them to

the generosity of benefactors. They had been in the city for ten or twelve days visiting friends who had kindly offered them some help. Their excuse for the delay in asking the requisite permission to collect was that they wished first to become familiar with the locality so that they might know where to go. On being asked where they took their meals, as the superior of the convent where they were lodging had mentioned their being out of the convent for the greater part of the day in pursuit of their quest, they replied that they sometimes took meals with the friends whom they visited and at other times lunched at a restaurant—"because of the distance from the convent," said one; "and because mother told us not to give unnecessary trouble to the nuns at the academy who were busy," added the other.

His Grace listened. When he spoke, it was very kindly, asking a few questions by which he might ascertain their attitude to their superior at home, the general discipline and conduct of the community in which they lived, and their own religious ideals. In handing them back their letters he added an envelope which somewhat weakened the contents of his pocket-book, saying:

"This will take you back to your home. Tell your Reverend Mother that if she obtains a letter from her bishop to be presented to the Ordinary as soon as you arrive in the diocese in which she proposes to send you, for the purpose of collecting, the way will be made more easy for you, and you won't have to eat in public places and wander about in strange cities without guidance or protection."

He rose, and as they knelt to receive his blessing he handed to the elder nun a small volume treating of the religious life and its obligations, with the remark as he led them out:

"Get your tickets at once, and here is something for you to read on the way home. I have only the one copy of it, but you can meditate on it alternately as you read it."

His own nuns in the archdiocese gave as a rule little trouble. He himself saw to it that they observed their constitutions and rules, that they engaged in no financial enterprises without his immediate counsel and help. He insisted above all that the religious spirit and discipline were preserved by regular min-

istry on the part of the local clergy. His visits to the convents, whether they were official, or for the purpose of administering the sacraments, or to examine postulants and receive or profess the religious, invariably gave him occasion to speak to the communities on the religious life. While he felt that his office and state as head of the diocese represented the perfection of the hierarchial dignity, he knew that he himself was bound to aim at the perfection of priestly life by the vow of his consecration. He claimed no superiority over those who sought advancement through the evangelical counsels, unless it were that through him holy obedience was to be fostered and exercised by the furtherance of its observance among the religious and priests under his care.

His presence at the elections of superiors in the diocesan communities made it clearly understood that he proposed to protect the absolute freedom of the electors, and that in the exercise of their privilege to choose a mother for the community they were to be guided solely by considerations of a spiritually practical character, and not in any way by sentimental considerations. Neither traditions, nor any external influence such as suggestions from others, whether bishops, priests, religious or seculars, were to influence them. The religious vows meant that they had come to the convent to follow Christ, and to attain their own perfection by serving Him.

Religious poverty, as he viewed it, was incompatible with the claims not only of individual ownership, but of community wealth. Sumptuous housing was in his eyes a danger to the spirit of the religious life. Accordingly he was sometimes provokingly slow in sanctioning building enterprises in which monumental show predominated over useful provision for educational or charitable needs. The ambition or desire of display in religious architecture is closely allied to the pride of constructing a capitol or a theatre. Rich men build palaces and show-places for themselves. The instinct of raising monuments, apart from utility and the glory of God, is as old as the days of the Noachian flood, and although the Hebrew for "Tower of Babel" is literally "House of the Earthly Foundation of God", the building of it was meant to be an expression of human glory which led to confusion in inter-

preting the word of God. St. Francis of Assisi went back to the true idea of holy poverty as an evangelical counsel. Hence he would not have his monks under any pretext build for show.

The Archbishop would patiently listen to objections such as: "But you cannot get any pupils if you build a shack for a school instead of a respectable-looking academy. Your hospital will be discredited unless it makes the specialists and ranking surgeons feel that they are attached to an institution which proclaims its reputation by an imposing front and a lofty gateway as well as magnificent laboratories. The modern orphanage must by its very appearance eliminate the idea that it is the home of dependent children; the suggestion of comfortable accommodations has to be used to educate the young to cleanliness, neatness in appearance and joy as an element of contentment and the peace that is preached by Christianity."

These were good-sounding reasons. In the Archbishop's mind, however, they did not alter the fact that the Bringer of Christianity preferred a stable in which to start His work of bettering mankind, youth included. That, too, was at a time when stables for educational purposes were out of fashion. The Romans had no wish to suffer their children to be degraded by association with boys too poor to lodge with nice people. They scouted the idea of cultivating the society of illiterate farmers like the Bethlehemite shepherds. Of course we know that kings too came to visit the Holy Family and they brought gold to make the association respectable. Some call them foreigners who did not know any better, or visionaries who gazed at the stars instead of at the realities of life, when people were too busy with the census establishing pedigrees and family respectability so as to support the Roman exchequer.

Another thought which the Archbishop used to express on the subject of religion was that of the origin of religious institutes. The founders, one and all, of the religious communities that flourished for centuries, until worldly prosperity brought them to naught, had the courage of an utter disregard of the consequences that might follow the complete and open profession of poverty for the exercise of charity. Somehow or other kings and princes came to them also, despite the preference shown for stable accommodations by the wisest of

organizers. Their models were the Son of God, with His holy Mother, and Joseph, the Carpenter of royal blood. And the true nobility recognized the wisdom of these poor founders until the prudence of the world suggested to the community heads the need of regular income and of prudent provision for enlargement and accommodations in the service of charity.

Once an alien missionary came to the cathedral, seeking leave to stay for a time. He had been driven from his own country by the persecution of government officials who in their hostility to the Church charged the clergy unjustly with undue influence in matters purely political, and with amassing wealth and property to the detriment of the civil community. The religious, by underselling certain products of industry, were said to have succeeded in practically monopolizing the market, very much as business houses did elsewhere. The members of the orders could furnish cheap labor and thereby succeed in cornering the market for the produce from their extensive estates.

Sympathy everywhere was of course with the persecuted Catholics and especially with the religious who were made homeless; all the more so because in some cases they became heroic martyrs for the cause of religion.

The Archbishop gave not only unlimited hospitality to the missionary, but called on his diocesans to support the persecuted and suffering religious and clergy, many of whom had already come to the diocese.

Discussions about the reasons for the persecution and its various phases were quite common at table and in the smoking-room during these days. Our foreign religious was a man of culture, an excellent preacher and altogether a person who easily made friends in clerical as well as in lay circles. The fathers were tracing the outbreak of the hostilities one afternoon when old Father Bruskens dropped in to enliven the clerical conference.

At the moment our foreign missioner was reading a paper which he had prepared for the press to rouse sympathy among us for our fellow Catholics in the persecuted countries. His object was to create public coöperation in favor of the poor religious who had been driven out of their convents and left

without means of subsistence. The appeal contained accurate statistics regarding the past condition of the Church when the clergy and religious societies were allowed the free exercise of their beneficent activities and when religion prospered, as shown by the numerous institutions and churches erected throughout the country. The writer pointed out the injustice, political hatred and avarice which sought to confiscate ecclesiastical property under the pretext that these church holdings were injuring the people, though serving the private interests of the clergy and religious communities.

Father Bruskens had quietly taken a seat in a corner of the room and was listening with the rest of the company. When the address was finished they all applauded, saying that the paper was a masterpiece of appeal on behalf of religion, and at the same time a document of apologetic value which should be incorporated in the national history of the Church.

"What do you think of it, Father Bruskens?" asked the chancellor. "Don't you believe it would do good if it were printed in the Historical Pennwiper?"

"No! Not that section of it, at least, which has been read since I came in," said the forthright old priest.

"But that's the best part of it. Plain proof of the injustice of the persecution, from authentic statistics. A clear refutation of pretended reasons for the anti-Catholic government's hostility."

The old man took a pinch of snuff and offered the box to his neighbor. Then he said deliberately:

"The persecution is unjust. No doubt of that. The people who suffer from it should be helped. But the hatred of a devilish set of politicians who constitute the government, which is now making saints and martyrs of the people, does not make true the argument we have just heard and the reasons given for the exiling of the religious."

"Why, what do you mean?" asked the astonished chancellor. "Don't the statistics prove that the prosperity of the Catholic clergy, including the religious communities, was perfectly legitimate and at no time gave a just reason to the secular rulers to wrest it from them?"

The old Dutchman did not answer at once. He looked round for Father McCabe. Not seeing him, he slowly said:

"Your statistics are probably all right. That is just what is the matter with your argument."

"Father Bruskens perhaps means that statistics, though literally correct, may still lie, as the old proverb has it," said one of the conciliatory priests present.

"Not at all," answered the old man, a bit impatiently, though that was not his wont. "What I mean is that if the statistics our friend quotes are right and true, then it was high time for the persecution to come upon the Catholics and bring them to a right sense of their duty to religion. Wealth and prosperity weaken religion, as everybody knows."

"But, Father, the numerical figures just read out were meant to demonstrate that the wealth of religious houses at the time when the persecution began was not out of proportion to the general population," said the chancellor.

"Well, if those figures were right," persistently came Fr. Bruskens's reply, "then the religious bodies professing personal poverty were miles behind their vows, and needed a shaking up."

Everybody was shocked. Even the Archbishop looked grave, although he had great confidence in the common sense of his old friend.

"What is the particular statement," he mildly asked, "to which you refer, Father?"

"Well—the number of religious in proportion to the entire population was, as I understand it, tabulated. I don't remember the figures, but compared with the income *per capita* at the time before the persecution began, the clergy prospered. The item that struck me, was that the average income, as calculated for each member of the religious communities, was in American money about one dollar and twenty cents in the male orders, priests and brothers included; and one dollar and ten cents for each religious in the combined communities of women. The inference was drawn, as I heard it, that, compared to what an ordinary mechanic earns in the United States—say three dollars a day—this was undoubtedly poor compensation, if not plain starvation wages for men and women employed in works of useful industry and religious education. That sounds all right, but is it a fair comparison? How much did the day laborer in the same country and at the same time earn, who

was not a priest or religious? The hewer of wood and the washerwoman who had missed a vocation to the religious life, with a family to support, probably got less than half that sum a day."

"But, Father Bruskens," said the Archbishop, "you forget that the religious spent the income in charity, and labored habitually to better the conditions of their fellows at home and abroad."

"Of course they did," answered Father Bruskens. "What else would they do with the money unless there was a demand to enlarge their grounds, or build sanitariums and residences, which some call 'palaces', for the clergy, or the father abbot, or mother abbess. They were, in general, making things look prosperous in order to increase respect for religion. But you do not mention that, being well fed themselves, they made any effort to raise the wages of the poor laborers in their district. The working people are easily roused to rebellion against authorities, whether religious or civil, whom they see prospering while they themselves remain poor. Loud-talking demagogues always find a way to get control. Are the Catholic people on the side of the religious who owned the land or a large proportion of it? These religious had every opportunity to teach the young and preach to the grown-ups."

"Father," said the visiting religious, "I fear you are prejudiced. If you lived in our country as I have done, and saw the impious way in which those who are now in control of the government despise everything that is holy and good, you would not say these things."

"I am not speaking of the present condition of things you are complaining about, but of their remote cause," replied the unmoved old priest. "You and your people who seek refuge with us are in my estimation saints and sufferers for the faith of Christ. My fault-finding is with your *statistics*. They only prove that the forefathers of the present sufferers prepared the way for persecution by their prosperity, and you are paying for it now. We are no better ourselves here where the Church prospers. Our daily boast is about our magnificent growth, our influence in politics, our fine buildings. Leaders of the religion of Christ are looking for and dispensing decorations of merit. Some day we shall get the same answer you

are getting, though we are shrewder, and our methods are putting off the evil day."

"Archbishop," interjected Father Martin, by way of relieving the tenseness, "can't you muzzle this Dutchman? He is making trouble and should be penalized by an extra collection."

"My poor Belgians will be glad to give," said Father Bruskens. "They have talked to me already about the helpless nuns and homeless priests, driven out of a nominally Catholic country. But I don't tell them what I said just now. They have an idea that the Apostles left all things to follow Christ. One of my altar boys wants to be a priest. He likes the Capuchins, but his mother would like him to be, as she says, one of our parish priests, so that she could see him at Mass and hear his sermons, and have his comfort in her old days. She is a widow and has some property from which she has sufficient income. This, she says, she will leave to her boy so that he could build a nice church out of it when she is dead, and pray for her."

"Now that is more like what Father Remigius here wants to hear. He could come to your parish and talk French to your people, although from what you say that won't be necessary. You will give him a good collection anyhow." This came from the vicar general.

"Oh, Father Bruskens talks Dutch to his folks pretty much as he does to us. It does more good—eh, Father? But what did you say to the boy's mother about his becoming a priest?"

"I told her to let the lad alone. He will choose his own way, answering a vocation from God. Her business is to pray for the boy that he may be ready when the call is clear to him."

"And you mean to let that property go into other hands, perhaps of relatives who will never think of building a church?"

"I am not bothering about the property, but about the boy's vocation. As far as I remember, our Lord once said to St. Peter, who seemed to have his doubts about the wisdom of leaving home and trade to make a vow of religion: 'No man who has left house or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or children, or lands'—note the lands—'for My sake and for the Gospel, who shall not receive a hundred times as much now and in the world to come'."

One of the fathers who thought it his duty to defend the foreign visitor, turned to the old Dutchman in a pleasant way:

"Then you think that persecution of the Church is the fault of Catholics, or rather of the priests and religious. What about the early persecutions during the Roman Empire? Surely they weren't the result of Catholic prosperity, for those Christians were humble enough and had to hide in the bowels of the earth to keep their faith?"

"Yes, and what about Ireland suffering for seven centuries from the ambition of foreign conquerers?" added Dr. Norton.

"I did not say or imply", Father Bruskens said, "that persecution of the Catholic Church or its priesthood and religious orders is due solely to temporal prosperity and pride within the Church; that is, among its leaders and representatives. The devil has many ways of opening the gates of hell on Broadway. One way and the easiest is that of feeding the material from without so as to create spontaneous combustion within. Of course it all comes to the same thing in the end. Our Lord said, 'Blessed are the poor in spirit'. He also said, 'Blessed are they that suffer persecution'. His own persecution was brought on by a friend—one of our own set with an Apostolic call, but who unfortunately liked money and the company of the high priests."

"There is a good deal of truth in what Father Bruskens says," mildly interjected the vicar. "Even the early persecutions of Christians during the first three centuries of the Roman Empire are by many recent historians traced to the imprudent vauntings of those Christians who relied with pride on the fact that Diocletian's household sheltered a Christian empress and an army general who might favor them. The history of the so-called Reformation teaches a like lesson. Only dear old Ireland suffered for the faith alone and kept it."

"Poor Ireland!" ejaculated Norton.

"Yet rich in this, that the poor of every other land can call on the Irish Archbishop's pocket-book, as I and my countrymen have found out," added the stranger from the South.

[TO BE CONTINUED]

Analecta

S. CONGREGATIO DE SEMINARIIS ET DE STUDIORUM UNIVERSITATIBUS.

EPISTOLA AD RMOS ORDINARIOS, DE CATECHETICA DISCIPLINA IN SACRIS SEMINARIIS IMPENSE EXCOLENDA.

Illme ac Rme Domine,

Ad regnum Iesu Christi, Servatoris nostri, in terris instaurandum, nulla res plus confert, ex ipso divino instituto, quam eximia sacerdotalis ordinis sanctitas et doctrina. "Causae profecto graves, et omnium aetatum communes, decora virtutum multa et magna in sacerdotibus postulant: veruntamen nostra haec aetas plura quoque et maiora admodum flagitat" (Leo XIII, Enc. *Etsi nos,* 15 febr. 1882).

Cum autem idonei altaris ministri et studiosi animarum curatores nequeant evadere nisi, qui, in sacris Seminariorum septis adolescentes, ad omnem virtutis et scientiae decorem rite instituantur, Sancta Sedes Apostolica sapientissimas edidit leges de huiusmodi institutis, quorum cum statu ipsa Ecclesiae fortuna coniungitur maxime.

Nos quidem omnia, quae de hac re statuta sunt, ab omnibus, quorum interest, religiose servari confidimus; sed unum est maximi momenti et ponderis, quod universos sacrorum Antistites diligenter attendere percupimus, idque spectat *ad rationem seu methodum christianae doctrinae tradendae.*

Codicis iuris canonici canone 1365 § 3 praescribitur ut in cursu theologico, qui saltem integro quadriennio debet con-

tineri, "habeantur etiam lectiones de Theologia pastorali, *additis practicis exercitationibus praesertim de ratione tradendi pueris aliisque catechismum*".

Quam congruenter quamque necessario haec praecipiantur, facile intelliget quisquis animadvertat officium docendi christianam plebem, quo tenentur sacerdotes omnes, praesertim curiones, omnium officiorum primum esse et maximum: ex eius enim observatione aut neglectu salus vel ruina animarum magna ex parte pendet. Apertum notumque est gravissimum Benedicti XIV, sapientissimi Pontificis, effatum: "Illud affirmamus magnam eorum partem, qui aeternis suppliciis damnantur, eam calamitatem perpetuo subire ob ignorantiam mysteriorum fidei, quae scire et credere necessario debent, ut inter electos cooptentur" (*Inst. XXVI,* 18).

Hinc, ex iuris canonici praescripto, debet parochus, ut gravissimum impleat officium suum de catechetica populi christiani institutione, pueros ad sacramenta Poenitentiae, Confirmationis et Eucharistiae rite suscipienda praeparare, eosque, postquam primum Sancta de altari libaverint, uberis ac perfectius excolere, item fidelibus adultis catechismum, sermone ad eorum captum accommodato, explicare (can. 1329-32).

Huiusmodi autem officio ceteros presbyteros, atque etiam clericos, teneri, constat ex sequenti: "Presbyteri aliique clerici, nullo legitimo impedimento detenti, proprio parocho in hoc sanctissimo opere adiutores sunto, etiam sub poenis ab Ordinario infligendis" (can. 1333 § 2). At, cum rudium praesertim et imperitorum institutio de rebus altissimis, sermone ad eorum captum accommodato, res sit perdifficilis aeque ac pernecessaria, ideo ad tantum opus diuturna ac prorsus diligens adhibenda est praeparatio. Haec fieri debet in sacris Seminariis: ad hoc enim sunt ipsa constituta. Ut autem munus docendi christianum populum rite et fructuose quis obeat, non sufficit praeparatio doctrinalis, quae in veritatum tradendarum cognitione versatur quaeque fit per studium sacrae theologiae, praesertim dogmaticae, sed requiritur etiam illa quae dicitur *didascalica,* ad modum pertinens quo veritates tradi debent, eaque fit tum per congrua praecepta tum per practicas exercitationes.

Ad rem Summus Pontifex Pius X in memorabili Encyclica *Acerbo nimis* (15 apr. 1905): "Facilius longe est reperire

oratorem, qui copiose dicat ac splendide, quam catechistam, qui praeceptionem habeat ex omni parte laudabilem. Quamcumque igitur facilitatem cogitandi et loquendi quis a natura sit nactus, hoc probe teneat, numquam se de christiana doctrina ad pueros vel ad populum cum animi fructu esse dicturum, nisi multa commentatione paratum atque expeditum. Falluntur sane qui plebis imperitia ac tarditate fisi, hac in re negligentius agere se posse autumant. E contrario, quo quis rudiores nactus sit auditores, eo maiore studio ac diligentia utatur oportet, ut sublimissimas veritates, adeo a vulgari intelligentia remotas, ad obtusiorem imperitorum aciem accommodet, quibus aeque ac sapientibus, ad aeternam beatitudinem adipiscendam sunt necessariae".

Quae cum ita sint, Amplitudinem tuam enixe rogamus ut hoc iuris canonici praeceptum vehementer urgeas operamque des ut in Seminario tuo impense excolatur disciplina catechetica; quam ob rem magister theologiae pastoralis praelectiones de ratione doctrinae christianae tradendae frequentes habeat, et clerici ipsi ad tantum opus sese practice exerceant, sive in Seminario, sive in ecclesiis, prout prudentia suaserit.

Haec sunt, Amplissime Praesul, quae ad te, sicut et ad ceteros sacrorum Antistites, habuimus hac de re scribere. Placet litteram nostram absolvere verbis, quibus Summus Pontifex Leo XIII Episcopos Peruviae simili in casu hortabatur: "Haec si praestabitis et clerus florebit honore suo, et Ecclesiae laus manebit, quae semper optimorum studiorum fautrix et altrix est habita vereque habenda est. Vobis praeterea idonei homines praesto erunt, qui, vocati in partem ministerii vestri, magno vobis erudiendis populis pietatique fovendae usui futuri sint et adiumento". (Breve *Inter graves,* 1 maii 1894).

Interim Deum, benignum bonorum omnium largitorem, humiliter adprecamur ut te cunctosque fideles, pastorali sollicitudini tuae concreditos, uberrimis caelestis gratiae auxiliis munerari dignetur.

Romae, ex Secretaria S. Congregationis Seminariis et Studiorum Universitatibus praepositae, die 8 septembris an. 1926.

Amplitudini tuae
addictissimus in Domino
CAIETANUS Card. BISLETI, *Praefectus.*
✠ Iacobus Sinibaldi, Episc. Tiberien., *Secretarius.*

S. CONGREGATIO DE RELIGIOSIS.

11 Decembris.—Congregationem Sororum Sanctae Mariae, Oregonopolitan., cuius domus princeps sita in eadem Oregonopolitan. archidioecesi *laudavit et commendavit, eiusque Constitutiones, experimenti gratia, ad septennium, approbavit* SS. D. N. Pius, Pp. XI.

DIARIUM ROMANAE CURIAE.

Recent Pontifical Appointments.

14 April, 1926: Messrs. Thomas Giordano, Cornelius Gallagher and Condé B. Pallen, of the Archdiocese of New York, Knights of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class.

20 July: Mr. Antonio Ruffu, of the Diocese of Trenton, Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class.

3 September: Monsignor Moses E. Kiley, of the Archdiocese of Chicago, Domestic Prelate of His Holiness.

10 November: The Rev. James Redmond (by rescript of the S. Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith) member of the Superior General Council for the Propagation of the Faith in England.

15 November: Dr. Arthur Leclerc, of the Archdiocese of Quebec, Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class.

1 December: Monsignor Lionel J. O'Kelly, of the Diocese of Salford, Protonotary Apostolic *ad instar participantium* of His Holiness.

2 December: Monsignor Herman F. Wolf, of the Archdiocese of Chicago, Domestic Prelate of His Holiness.

13 December: Mr. Thomas F. Forschner, of the Archdiocese of Chicago, Knight of the Order of Pope St. Sylvester.

18 December: Monsignor Hugh MacSherry, Titular Bishop of Giustinianapoli, Assistant at the Pontifical Throne.

20 December: Monsignor John Thomas Noonan, of the Diocese of Des Moines, Protonotary Apostolic *ad instar participantium* of His Holiness.

Studies and Conferences

Questions, the discussion of which is for the information of the general reader of the Department of Studies and Conferences, are answered in the order in which they reach us. The Editor cannot engage to reply to inquiries by private letter.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:—

SACRED CONGREGATION OF SEMINARIES AND OF UNIVERSITIES addresses a letter to the Ordinaries of the world on the importance of training seminarians in the art of catechizing children and others.

SACRED CONGREGATION OF RELIGIOUS approves, for a seven years' trial, the constitutions of the Congregation of the Sisters of St. Mary, in the Archdiocese of Oregon City.

ROMAN CURIA announces officially some recent Pontifical appointments.

FOR THE BETTER CATECHISM.

Much attention has been aroused by the article, "Why not have a Better Catechism?" in the February issue of the REVIEW. A writer who has had extensive experience as a catechist asks: "Could not the subject be presented by some competent speaker at the next *Educational Conference* and gain action?"

It has also been suggested that the title of a catechism adopted for common use should not bear any personal indication. The excellent "Faerber's Catechism" has failed, it is said, to be acceptable to non-German teachers for no other reason. This applies to the United States, owing to different nationalities with racial prejudices.

The subject is of decided importance, and with present means of organized action at Washington it should not be difficult to attain practical results.

EXPERIENCES WITH THE BALTIMORE CATECHISM.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

No one claims that children can understand the Baltimore Catechism. Everyone admits that both its words and its long, involved sentences have no meaning for them. The supposed improvement of a lengthy glossary at the head of each chapter is in itself *prima facie* evidence of the soundness of this conviction.

Why, then, all those precious hours consumed year after year on repeated and disheartening attempts to memorize enigmas? The one only defence of the practice is stated as follows: "We all realize that children do not understand the Baltimore Catechism: but they can memorize it when they are young: later in life the meaning will dawn upon their intelligence."

Are there no properly-trained teachers of religion?

To say the least, the system is the advocacy of a most singular pedagogy. Is there any body of educationalists in the world prepared to recommend this method for the teaching of history, grammar, arithmetic, elocution or any other branch of secular study with which our schools have to deal? Sometimes, however, this question is met by a counter objection: the teaching of religion, it is claimed, must have a pedagogy of its own. That is to say, children cannot be given an understanding and knowledge of the truths of religion by the same mental processes as put them in possession of other matters of study.

In answer to this contention, we are surely entitled to ask, does not the child use the same memory and the same intellect in studies of a religious nature as he must use in the prosecution of secular studies? Will some one please come forward and explain in what way the process must be essentially different, the same mental faculties being called into requisition?

The curriculum of studies in our ecclesiastical seminaries is almost exclusively religious. As a matter of fact, as a matter of regular established practice, is the student, on admission to their classes, required to repudiate the psychology and abandon the pedagogy underlying his high school and college training and adapt himself to a system essentially new and different? Does anything like this actually obtain at all? Is a seminarian

with a college degree, a normal school training and years of application of this training as a high school teacher, necessarily handicapped in a theological seminary because of a previous pedagogic formation which will not harmonize with the methods of study insisted upon by his new professors?

If there really is a distinct pedagogy required for the teaching of catechism, surely it is all-important that Catholic school teachers, not to say we, pastors and assistants, be thoroughly drilled in its principles. Then, what about our supervision of young religious teachers, just fresh from the State Normal School? We must be assiduous from the outset in impressing upon them that one system of pedagogy must be followed from 9 to 9.30 A. M. and another altogether different for the remainder of the day, that any confusion of the two methods might have serious consequences.

The necessity of this double system can best be appreciated by examining its working in detail. A text book or series of lectures, setting forth the distinctions that must be observed in the application of their respective methods, would contain, among other important subject matter, dissertations under such headings as the following:—

1. The human memory acts in a manner radically different when learning the Ten Commandments and learning ten formulae of similar length from any ordinary text book.

2. Children will not be able to recite the story of Adam's fall, of the Prodigal Son or the Scriptural account of the General Judgment, if they try to learn them by an act of memory similar to that by which they succeed in remembering stories from their class readers.

3. The facts recorded of the life, death and resurrection of our Lord, cannot be remembered if pupils try to learn them in the same way as they learn other historical facts.

4. In apprehending what is meant by mortal sin, grace, merit, indulgences, the operations of the intellect are altogether different from the operations required to understand general terms in other branches of study.

5. A pupil cannot understand the purpose of Baptism, Confirmation or Extreme Unction if his intellect acts in the same way as when grasping the purpose of certain things spoken of in grammar or physics.

6. When in a catechism class the pupil is required to give a reason for certain beliefs, opinions, conclusions, it must be understood that a process of reasoning which will be strictly logical in other classes may be highly illogical here. What would be a sound, logical inference between the hours 9.30 A. M. and 3. P. M. may be very illogical between 9. and 9.30 A. M.

7. In general, it must be remembered that to apprehend, reason upon, discuss, memorize, retain information enunciated in catechisms or Bible histories, the mental faculties function in a manner altogether different from the processes manifesting themselves in the prosecution of studies of a secular character.

Where are we teachers, lay or clerical, old or young, to go for a thorough grounding in this particular art of teaching religion? Who will tell us definitely in what these differences of method consist?

I trust I shall be forgiven a seeming levity in the deductions I have just been making. Seven tenets more absurd than those above could hardly be imagined. Nevertheless any one who claims that the methods of teaching regularly in use in our schools are not applicable to religious instruction is bound to subscribe to every one of the seven.

Who remembers the words of the Catechism?

While we are inquiring for this special work on the pedagogy of religious instruction, perhaps we shall be told that the general application of its principles is outlined in the method indicated above. "An unintelligible text book is no objection; perhaps on the whole it is an advantage. Let children memorize it in their school days; later on, when they are men and women, they will grasp the sense of what its questions and answers state".

Now, it is perfectly clear that, to insure the success of that method, one thing is absolutely essential—they must remember the answers they memorized; otherwise how will the meaning dawn upon their intelligence? The real question, then, is, "Do they remember them when they have grown up?" What is your personal experience in this matter? Have you actually made a test and found that the great majority of Catholics in all walks of life can recite the catechism answers

which they spent years in memorizing and which at one time they gave forth as accurately as the Lord's Prayer?

I wish to report that I have made this test over and over. What is more, I have made it among the very class of Catholics of whom the best results should be expected. In different cities, whenever the opportunity presented itself, I have given such an examination to the pupils of high schools, usually selecting the pupils of the tenth grade. The examination consisted simply in dictating ten or twelve questions from the Baltimore Catechism and requiring pupils to write down the answers given in the text. I am keeping the papers handed in on those occasions. Anyone is free to look them over. The candidates, on an average, have failed to answer one question out of ten. What is more surprising, in the majority of cases, candidates proved unequal to giving even a fragment of any one answer.

Remember, these are pupils in the tenth grade. For seven or eight years in the primary school, they had been required to memorize these very answers, drilled in them three, four, or five times every week. In less than two years after, they had completely forgotten them. If such is happening among our Catholic high school pupils, are we to believe that laboring men, street-car drivers, mechanics, farmers, with their wives and grown-up sons and daughters, would make a more satisfactory showing on the same test? And if the results I am now publishing are fair specimens of the working of this system among Catholics all over the land during the past forty-five years—and I see no reason for not regarding these results as a fair specimen—nothing further is needed to entirely destroy all confidence in a practice so long and so generally adopted.

In nearly one hundred dioceses, thousands of priests, tens of thousands of teachers, hundreds of thousands of parents are, week after week, devoting hours to the strenuous task of having millions of children commit to memory a number of answers from the Baltimore Catechism which convey no meaning to the learner and teach no truth. The time set apart for acquiring a knowledge of religion, for knowing and understanding what our Holy Faith has to tell us, is consumed in memorizing unintelligible formulae in the hope that five or ten years later their meaning will dawn on developing minds. The task is

necessarily repulsive to all, parent, teacher, and child. What should be the most fascinating of studies has become an unbearable drudgery. It has no interest; it makes no appeal; it conveys no idea which the pupil will find a pleasure in recalling or communicating to others; it arouses no curiosity and stimulates no inquiry. It is an experience to which no one looks forward with pleasure, which the less-gifted pupils abhor and which parents less fervent and faithful are prone to shirk and neglect. Conscientious parents and devoted teachers persevere in it because of an assurance of results. And now we find there are no results; that long before the date when fruition would be a possibility, the formulae memorized under so much disadvantage are forgotten, lost, gone forever.

"Preposterous!" I hear some one indignantly protest; "Do you dare to say that our Catholic children are not learning their religion in home and school and church?" I sincerely trust I have said nothing of the kind. They certainly are learning very much from constant instructions, formal and incidental, zealously imparted by priest, parent and teacher. But they are not learning any religion during the time they spend memorizing catechism answers which they do not understand, any more than they would learn their religion by memorizing these same answers translated into Latin or Hebrew. Is there not a story of a French cook who boasted that he could make soup with a stone? No problem whatever, all necessary ingredients being put into the cauldron *with* the stone. One naturally asks, "Why the stone, which contributes nothing to the result?" Why, also, ceaseless tasks of memorizing enigmas which contribute nothing to the result?

The amount of time and energy squandered upon a task so disagreeable, discouraging and fruitless is nothing short of a relentless tragedy. And to think all this might be avoided by the simple expedient of selecting a catechism whose questions and answers children can understand!

AN EX-SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

IS UNIFORMITY UNDESIRABLE?

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Apropos of the "efforts to introduce uniformity in community worship, especially at the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass", as discussed in the February REVIEW (p. 201), every aid in that direction deserves wholehearted commendation. But the writer's concession to local differences appears to weaken the import of the rule laid down in the Missal which he quotes as a guiding principle.

To argue that priests are bound (generally) under grave precept to observe the rubrics of the Mass, but that a like obligation does not bind the people attending, seems to ignore the reason of "decentia" or propriety for all to coöperate in the Holy Mystery of which they are partakers.

Authors who maintain that the rubrics are directive, also hold that they may not be set aside "cum scandalo, ex contemptu, vel animo novum ritum inducendi", and that to do so is a grave sin.

As for children, they may easily be trained to kneel correctly for 25 to 30 minutes i. e. straight and erect, while occupied with prayer and song.

For the acolytes the proper vesture is the black cassock, though there may be excuse for the more showy red or white on occasion of pages carrying the train or insignia. The competent judge in such matters as to propriety and taste is the priest. He should not be left to the sentimental feminine taste which drapes and "dolls up" the altar boys, producing the effect of girlish gowns with flowing ribbons, flashy sashes and Puritanic collars and capes. Why should priests permit these things which turn the alb (whole linen) and surplice into flimsy window curtains with little of the prescribed garment (alb) left?

NON-GAZOL.

THE SUNDAY EPISTLES AND GOSPELS.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

The articles on the Sunday Epistles and Gospels by the Rev. George O'Neill, S.J., of Melbourne, will strike priests as of direct practical value. Many of us surely wish that the

Sacred Congregation which is entrusted with the revision of the liturgical books, including the Missal, might take up the matter of adjusting the reading of the Epistles and Gospels to the present devotional needs of the people, when frequent Communion and the urgencies of home life in our great American cities make timely and brief instruction, through the reading of New Testament passages at Mass, an important item in Catholic life. It would surely help both priest and people.

Appropriateness and fair uniformity in length of the readings from Epistle and Gospel on successive Sundays would be a gain to liturgical devotion. In this connexion would it not be a help if the reading of the Passion on Palm Sunday could be condensed, seeing that, with the Blessing of the Palms, it tends often to weariness and omission of the brief homily or sermon. We have not the old-time serenity and patience allowing such functions to be performed, as in early days of Christianity when people could watch all night, for there were no other calls made on them in the rush of things as we have them to-day. So also with the Prophecies on Holy Saturday, when a poor country pastor, without an assistant, has to hear hundreds of confessions on the same day, and attend sick-calls at a distance. Might not these readings of the Passion and the Prophecies be transferred to or distributed through the week?

PASTOR VILLANUS.

FORM OF EPISCOPAL CONSECRATION.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

The interesting discussion regarding the validity of non-Catholic baptism in the February number of the REVIEW suggests some reflections on the subject of episcopal consecration, which is referred to by the learned writer in the following passage: "We may note, too, that the unexpanded Anglican sacramental form for episcopal consecration is literally identical with that part of the Pontifical wherein the contemporary common opinion placed the form of consecration." The inference is, of course, that the form of episcopal consecration, according to the common opinion mentioned, consists in the words: "Accipe Spiritum Sanctum." Thus in a brochure recently published as a guide to the ceremonies of episcopal

consecration, we read: "The imposition of hands with the words of Christ, 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' is the essential and simple rite by which the Episcopal Order is conferred."

With due deference to the opinion that places the form of episcopal consecration in the words, "Accipe Spiritum Sanctum," it would seem more probable that the essential form is found in the Preface, which follows the prayer "Propitiare". In this consecrating Preface occur the words: "Comple in sacerdote tuo ministerii tui summam."

It may be objected that these words do not *accompany* the imposition of hands, and that the matter and form of a sacrament must be *united*. A moral union nevertheless suffices, and this is surely found in the imposition of hands and the prayers that immediately follow. Besides, in conferring the priesthood, the bishop imposes his hands in silence on the head of the ordinand, and even the words that accompany the subsequent extension of his right hand, "Oremus, fratres carissimi," etc., are simply an invitation to pray, a mere "allocutio", as Lehmkuhl says, and can hardly be regarded as the sacramental form, found in the words: "Da quaesumus, omnipotens Pater, in hunc famulum tuum presbyterii dignitatem." Here the form is pronounced after the matter has been applied.

In fact, the words, "Accipe Spiritum Sanctum," are so indeterminate that it is *doubtful* whether they constitute a sacramental form. Someone may object that they are determined by the very circumstances of the ceremony, especially by the prayers that follow. But must not a sacramental form be worded with sufficient clearness and accuracy to express *of itself* the nature of the sacrament? Pope Leo XIII implies this when he writes, in his judgment of invalidity of Anglican Orders, that the form should "*definitely express* the Sacred Order of Priesthood, or its grace and power". Besides, the same Supreme Pontiff considered insufficient the form, "Receive the Holy Ghost," used in the Anglican Ordinal.

It may be further objected that, in the ordination of a deacon, the form used, "Accipe Spiritum Sanctum," etc., is equally indeterminate unless it be determined by the circumstances of the ceremony, particularly by the following prayer. This objection is a "petitio principii," for the form of the

diaconate consists far more probably in the words that follow the physical imposition with the extension of the bishop's right hand: "Emitte in eum, quaesumus, Domine, Spiritum Sanctum, quo in opus ministerii tui fideliter exsequendi septiformis gratiae tuae munere roboretur."

Applying the principle enunciated by Pope Leo XIII, that the form should definitely express the sacred order, or its grace and power, one finds it rather difficult to see the sacramental form in the imperative words, "Accipe Spiritum Sanctum," used in conferring the diaconate or the episcopate, whereas the sacramental words are readily recognized in the following prayers in which specific mention is made of the Order conferred. As regards deaconship we find mention of the "work of the ministry" ("opus ministerii"); as regards priesthood we find the express words, "dignity of the priesthood" ("presbyterii dignitatem"); and as regards the episcopate we find express mention of the "fulness of the ministry in the priest" ("comple in sacerdote tuo ministerii tui summam").

It is historically beyond doubt that the imperative words mentioned above, "Receive the Holy Ghost," were added to the Roman rite after many centuries. Nor are they used even to-day in the Oriental rite which is recognized by Rome. It is equally certain historically that the Church, in conferring the diaconate, priesthood, and episcopate, has never failed to use a deprecative form in which express mention is made of the respective order, or its grace and power.

Although Cardinal Gasparri may be quoted (as in your February issue) in favor of allowing the validity of episcopal consecration conferred through the form "Accipe Spiritum Sanctum," when this form receives determination from its setting in the Ordinal, the following quotation from the eminent canonist's same work (*Tractatus Canonicus de Sacra Ordinatione,* Vol. II) is very striking: "Si impositio manus et verba quae antiquitus certe erant materia et forma, adhuc sunt in ritu, ordinationis iuxta Pontificale Romanum, putamus ordinationem valere per illam manus impositionem et per illa verba. Nam valde improbabile est Ecclesiam huic materiae et huic formae vim sacramentalem ademisse, tum quia Ecclesia ab his mutationibus abhorret, etiam quando potestate certa potitur."

M. D. FORREST, M.S.C.

Natick, Rhode Island.

LOSS OF BLESSING OF THE ALB.

Qu. Wapelhorst states regarding the loss of blessing of the sacred vestments: "Execrantur quando ita trita sunt, vel quando forma propria ita privantur ut usui suo servire non possint, v. g. quando manicae plane separantur ab alba, licet statim conjungantur." If separating the sleeve from the alb causes the loss of the blessing, it would seem that separating the lace bottom (16 to 18 inches or more in width) from the linen body of the alb, would likewise cause the loss of the blessing. Hence the question: must the alb be blessed anew each time the lace is detached in laundering, as is the custom in order to preserve the more delicate lace-work?

Resp. The sleeves of the alb are an integral part of the garment originally known as a tunic of white linen and worn at the Holy Sacrifice as a symbol of purity. As such the alb should indeed cover the entire body. Nevertheless its actual length as a tunic is relative, whereas the lace attached to its body or its sleeves is regarded as ornamental. To separate this ornamental part does not destroy the essential form of a garment or tunic. But to cut off the sleeves is to take away the vestment's natural form. That the liturgical authorities of the Church so regard it is evident from the wording in which the S. Congregation tolerates as an ornament the use of the "Alba *ornata fimbriis* seu reticulo a cingulo deorsum" (Cf. Wapelhorst: *Compendium S. Liturgiae,* art. VI, n. 34). The ornament may be removed, whereas the sleeves, without which the alb loses its character of a sacred tunic, are an essential part of the vestment.

THE VEIL OF THE OSTENSORIUM.

Qu. May I ask you to give your opinion in the REVIEW on the following questions?

1. Is there any obligation on an individual pastor to obey Dec. 4268 S. C. R. with regard to the use of a veil for the monstrance, when the general practice of the diocese is not to use it and its introduction would be liable to cause comment among the faithful as to why it should be used in one church and not in another?

2. The monstrance is so large that in order to cover it one would have to stand on the scabellum and it is so constructed that considerable difficulty might be experienced in putting on a veil and taking it off because the cloth would be continually catching on the sharp

points of the rays. Would these two facts constitute a sufficient *incommodum* to excuse from the use of the veil?

3. What is the customary form of this veil? Is it sewed, somewhat like a large envelope, or is it a flat piece like a chalice veil?

SACRISTA.

Resp. A general practice of the diocese in neglect of a definite liturgical prescription, and the fear that correction of the neglect would be liable to cause comment among the faithful as to why it should be used in one church and not in another, do not constitute a valid reason for the non-observance of rubrics relating to the public worship of the Blessed Sacrament. Nor would the quality and size of the monstrance excuse from such observance, since the form of the sacred vessels for the service of the Blessed Sacrament is determined by the prescribed use of these articles. Apparently the *incommodum* in the proposed case arises from conditions which may be controlled by the ministry of the sanctuary; for the material and form of the prescribed veil can be adapted to serve the purpose of a regulation intended to prevent irreverence to the Blessed Sacrament.

Ordinarily the *Decreta authentica* of the Sacred Congregations, when they are interpretations of a general liturgical or disciplinary law of the Church, bind all who are not nominally exempted by privilege or by necessity. Under the head of privilege is to be classed what is called a legitimate custom or *consuetudo* of extended (forty years, a century, or immemorial) duration. Such a custom is nevertheless held to be illegitimate unless definitely recognized by the Holy See or its organ, the Sacred Congregation itself—"nulla consuetudo contra rubricas aut S.R.C. decreta possit esse legitima, nisi specialiter fuerit a S. Sede approbata" (Cf. *Liturgicae Institutiones,* Tract. I, cap. IV, De S.R.C. obligatione et de Consuetudine. C. Callewaert. Brugis, 1925.)

Since the precise form of the veil is not prescribed, its purpose being mainly to warn the faithful that the Sacred Host is not actually in the ostensorium at the moment, a very light folder of linen, silk, or gauze, easily removed, will serve the purpose.

The custom of placing the monstrance, before or after exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, in an oblique angle toward

the congregation might of course serve the same purpose, namely of showing that the Sacred Host is not in the ostensorium; but the method is not so secure, nor does it conform to the rule.

As regards popular comment about what is done in this matter in one church and not in another, it is hardly apt to cause scandal, and in any case may be prevented by the vigilance of episcopal visitors calling for uniformity in the matter of rubrical or liturgical observance.

ORGANIZATION OF CATHOLIC LAYMEN.

Qu. Kindly give the information as to what is the proper procedure for a secular priest, preoccupied with the idea which is shared by many other secular priests, of establishing in the United States a society of lay people, of both sexes, whose end will be the espousing of every cause that may arise in a rural parish, or a parish located in a missionary section, always of course under the direction of the parish priest. It is proposed to assign to such lay people work like this: visiting the sick, catechizing the children in towns and remote districts, without regard to the number of those to be catechized, seeking fallen-away Catholics, attending to the altar or chapel or church, caring for the parish house, linen of the pastor, preparing his meals, erecting and managing recreation centers, camp sites, working girls' homes, organizing and directing Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, conducting retreat houses, settlement work, operating hospitals, etc. These priests are all in excellent standing.

Would it be obligatory upon the members that they must be Religious with the usual vows? Wear a habit or garb? Could not such a society be composed of generous, willing, young Catholic men and women, who would not take the religious vows, and of others who would take such vows? Should the matter be brought first to the attention of the Ordinary of the diocese, obtain his authorization, or should it first be taken to Rome for a *Beneplacitum*, then referred to the Ordinary?

Of course the conducting of primary and grammar schools and even high schools will fall within the province of the projected society. Membership will be confined to boys and girls of proper age and recommendation from pastors, preference being given to poor and deserving candidates, and the children in large families.

It is also proposed in time to establish a band of secular priests who will be ready at all times for work in hamlets, villages, and small towns, whenever the bishop calls for their services. The lay

members will even pledge themselves to their duty at the risk of missing Holy Mass on Sundays and holidays of obligation on account of the scarcity of priests. Members will pledge themselves to discard all racial and color lines in their work. In short, members, lay and priest, are to be ready at all times to be coöperators in the works of the Lord like the first Christians, under the bishops of the Church.

Lastly, give any objections that may be entertained to the early establishment of such a society, and give the essentials for the canonical establishment of this society.

RUSTICUS.

Resp. It is an essential right of parish administration for a pastor to organize, within his parish, societies or confraternities of laymen and women to aid him in the work of instruction and active charity to which he is bound as a priestly leader of the flock.

When, however, these societies or confraternities established for coöperation in pastoral work adopt the name, title, constitution, habit (regalia), responsibilities and obligations which connect their activity with kindred organizations outside the parish limits, so as to affiliate them not only in spirit but in external form with societies or confraternities of a diocesan scope or with institutes under the control of the Universal Church, their organization assumes the character of membership and requires the official approbation of the heads of such societies or institutes.

A society of laymen organized for educational or charitable objects and not affiliated with an established canonical confraternity or religious order of a diocesan scope or as an institute under the control and immediate direction of the Holy See, is entirely free to do its good works under the guidance of the local pastor.

A society formed among priests for similar purposes of promoting religious or pastoral success being an ecclesiastical institution, calls for the approval of the Ordinary; and if interdiocesan, for the express sanction of the superiors, secular or religious, who are understood to direct the pastoral activity of the clerical body for which they become responsible.

Where the members of a parish organization pledge themselves by solemn or perpetual vow, and in the name of the Church, their act assumes the nature of a mutual contract. In

this sense the observance of a rule of life involves an appeal to ecclesiastical authority—diocesan, or of the Holy See, and is regulated by the canons of the Church. Where without such vows the association claims ecclesiastical privileges such as indulgences and right of assembly in the name of and within the province of the Church, the Ordinary has the right of interference to prevent abuses. In all cases such organizations under parochial jurisdiction are subject to the examination which the Ordinary makes on occasion of his canonical visitation for the purpose of ascertaining the status of religion within his diocese.

In other respects associations of laymen, organized by the pastor or adopted by him for the furtherance of educational and charitable work within the parish, are non-ecclesiastical. Hence they do not fall within the ecclesiastical canons, even if they are governed by a rule or constitution such as the Tertians or the members of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, unless special provision reserves their exercise of action as members of an established confraternity recognized by the Church.

An instructive exposition of this distinction was given by the S. Congregation of Council (13 Nov. 1920) regarding the functions of the St. Vincent de Paul Society and published in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* vol. XIII, pp. 135-144.

PAYMENT OF DEBT.

Qu. John, on his deathbed, confides to his son James (by his first wife) that he has debts of many years' standing, amounting to several thousand dollars. The son James assumes the debts in order to quiet his father's fears.

John has been practically bankrupt, though not by legal procedure, due largely to reverses caused by the elements and others, until he married the widow Bertha, who had a small property. John henceforth turned over his earnings to Bertha and by economy and real estate trades they are worth about $12,000. Bertha has all the property in her name. During his illness John tries to induce Bertha to sign over enough to him to pay his debts. She refuses, on the plea that he might need his equity to pay for the expense of his long illness.

When James assumes the debt of his father, he has hopes of inducing Bertha, his stepmother, to help in the payment of the debt.

John dies, leaving sufficient insurance money to cover the expenses of his illness and funeral. Still Bertha refuses to contribute anything toward the debts.

1. In how far is James under obligation to pay the debt of his father now assumed by him? No interest has been paid for years. Must he pay the principal with compound interest?

2. May he use persuasion to make a settlement with the creditors? In one instance a creditor gratefully accepted $550 in settlement of a debt of $1100, after insinuating that he supposed he would have to be satisfied.

3. May James invest his surplus earnings in real estate in the hope of realizing good profits which he would use to pay his father's debts?

4. Must he deny himself luxuries the same as if the debts had been incurred by his own fault?

5. Is Bertha obliged in conscience to pay anything toward the debts?

R. CONFESSARIUS.

Resp. 1. James rests under the obligation of restitution only in so far as he seriously assumed the obligation at the time he promised to assume the debts of his father. He inherited nothing from his father, and hence the only source of obligation is the promise which he made. In order to verify an obligation from justice, James must be convinced that at the time he made the promise he seriously intended to contract an obligation in justice. The mere intention to pay the debts sometime, expressed to quiet his father's fears, would not oblige him in justice to its fulfilment. The nature of the promise he made is the measure of his obligation.

De Lugo holds that the intention of obligating oneself "ex iustitia" is generally absent in a gratuitous promise. Genicot goes further: "If any one makes a promise *in re gravi* without attending to whether he promises *ex fidelitate* or *ex iustitia, sub levi* or *sub gravi,* unless he made an oath or used witnesses or a written document, or in a pecuniary promise declared that he assumed a strict obligation, he must be presumed to be bound only *sub levi ex fidelitate.* Unless they use these formalities, men generally do not intend to assume a grave obligation in justice, by their promises, nor should this be presumed unless there is sufficient evidence of this intention."

James should decide the nature and extent of his obligation by the intention which he had; if he is in doubt, all doubts

should be resolved in his favor, and the strict obligation in justice should not be imposed.

2. On the supposition that James decides he incurred a grave obligation in justice, he is allowed to use persuasion to secure favorable reductions. Persuasion is a just means to invoke when one seeks condonation of a debt. The principle "volenti et consentienti non fit iniuria", is not affected by the use of persuasion, but by the use of force or fraud.

3. On the same hypothesis as before, James may defer restitution on the well grounded hope of larger profits in the future. He thus benefits the creditors as well as himself. They are to be presumed willing that he do so, and would be unreasonable to exact immediate payment under such conditions. Thus a debtor is not obliged to convert bonds into cash at a loss, to settle his debts immediately, when a delay would bring better returns.

4. Under the same supposition, James, though bound to restore, is not bound to do so in an unreasonable way. He may retain his state in life, in the surroundings and with the comforts to which he has been accustomed. This is stated on the general principle (Genicot I, 557) that a debtor is not bound to immediate restitution with a loss that is considerably greater than the loss of the creditor by the delay.

5. Bertha is not obliged to make restitution for her husband with any money or property which she has in her own right. She is however bound to make restitution with the money which she possesses and which she secured from her husband. This money was merely in the possession of her husband; the ownership was vested in those who had advanced him loans. Bertha therefore should make restitution in the measure that a prudent confessor should dictate.

AFFINITY AS A DIRIMENT IMPEDIMENT.

Qu. There are a number of statements and explanations regarding affinity as a diriment impediment to a valid marriage which leave the reader in doubt as to their proper interpretation.

Thus Father Noldin, S.J., in his *Summa Theologiae Moralis* (Edit. VI, n. 605, c.) writes: "Privigni qui pleno sensu tales sunt, i. e. qui nec patrem nec matrem communem habent, ut cum viduus habens filium ducit viduam habentem filiam, matrimonium inire possunt."

Goepfert (*Moraltheologie*, vol. III, edit. VIII, p. 365) writes: there exists a double relationship between such stepchildren—"Eine mehrfache Verwandtschaft besteht wenn (4) die in die Ehe mitgebrachten Kinder spaeter einander heirathen."

Ch. Augustine, O.S.B., commenting on Canon 1077 of the new Code (vol. V, p. 209, II ed.) writes: "a man cannot marry his uncle's stepdaughter".

The priests who edit *The Messenger of the Sacred Heart* (Jan. 1927) in the Question Box department, p. 70, write: "There is no relationship between a couple, if the father of the groom and the stepmother of the bride are brother and sister."

These various statements appear to contradict one another. May I ask the ECCL. REVIEW to explain the law of affinity as affecting the above cases. Possibly I may fail to properly interpret the authors mentioned. The questions involved seem to me, however, to call for a clear statement touching stepchildren as follows:

(1) Can stepchildren marry among themselves, i. e. may the children whom a widow brought into her marriage with a widower who also has children marry such children of the widow without a dispensation of the Church?

(2) May a man marry a stepdaughter of his uncle or aunt; or may a couple marry when the father of the groom and the stepmother of the bride are brother and sister?

Resp. The impediment of affinity has undergone many changes through the centuries both with regard to its basis and its range. In the earliest ecclesiastical legislation it arose from the "copula carnalis", whether licit or illicit; it extended to the fourth degree (i. e. indefinitely) in the direct line and to the seventh degree in the collateral line; it existed not only between the husband and the blood relatives of the wife and vice versa, but also between the blood relatives of the husband and the blood relatives of the wife ("affinitas egrediebatur copulatos"); it existed between the "affines" of the man and the "affines" of the woman ("affinitas pariebat affinitatem"); it existed between the child of a second marriage and the blood relatives of the first husband or wife.

In the Fourth Lateran Council many changes were introduced regarding the range of the impediment. The "copula carnalis" was retained as the basis; the impediment in the collateral line was restricted to the fourth degree; the impediment was abolished between the blood relatives of the husband

and the blood relatives of the wife; it was also abolished between the "affines" of the husband and the "affines" of the wife. Hence from that time the two principles held: "affinitas non egreditur copulatos" and "affinitas non parit affinitatem".

In the Council of Trent the "copula carnalis" was retained as the basis, but the impediment "ex copula illicita" was restricted to the second degree of the collateral line.

The Code reversed the traditional ecclesiastical legislation on affinity by positing as the basis of the impediment not the "copula carnalis" but valid marriage whether consummated or not (C. 97). By marriage husband and wife become one flesh, one person as it were, and the father of the husband becomes the father of the wife, the brother of the husband the brother of the wife, etc. Under the older legislation, since man and woman become one flesh by the "copula carnalis" (1 Cor. 6:16), this, whether inside or outside of marriage, was taken as the basis. The Code changed this and restored the basis of the old Roman law ("iustae nuptiae"), and the impediment now arises not from the physical union but the religious, as it were, viz. from a valid marriage. The husband takes over all the relatives of the wife and vice versa; but the relatives do not take each other over. By the Code legislation the impediment "ex copula illicita" was abolished; the old division of "affinitas antecedens" and "superveniens" lost its force; the impediment in the collateral line was restricted to the second degree.

The real difficulty arises when it becomes necessary to apply these principles to a concrete case. That the application of the principles is not easy is shown by the celebrated case submitted to the Congregation of the Council when Prosper Lambertinus (afterward Benedict XIV) was secretary (Benedict XIV, Quaes. Can. 166). Dominic married Martha a widow, who already had a son Mark. This Mark married Samaritana. Martha and Mark died and Dominic desired to marry Samaritana, his stepson's wife. The question was referred to four theologians, and the priest who struggles with problems of affinity may be consoled to know that they did not agree. One of them held that the impediment existed; three of them held that it was not present. The decision of the

Congregation, after a discussion which fills thirteen quarto pages, was that no impediment existed. Dominic was related by affinity to Mark, as Mark was a blood relative of his wife. He is not related by affinity to Samaritana, because Samaritana was not a blood relative of his wife; she is a relative by affinity, but after the Lateran Council "affinitas non parit affinitatem".

Noldin as quoted is correct. The impediment does not exist between the blood relatives of the husband and the blood relatives of the wife. Titius with a son Caius marries Sempronia with a daughter Maevia. Titius is related by affinity to Maevia; Sempronia is related by affinity to Caius. Caius and Maevia, while related in the general notion of affinity, as stepbrother and stepsister, are not bound by the impediment of affinity.

There is at hand no edition of Goepfert; if he intends stepchildren in the same sense as Noldin, he is incorrect; for this kind of affinity was abolished by the Lateran Council.

Augustine in the passage cited is quoting from the old law texts, as he says. The passage has no reference to the impediment of affinity as it now exists.

The Messenger of the Sacred Heart is also correct. Sempronia marries Titius who already has a daughter Maevia. Caius the brother of Sempronia has a son Cletus. Maevia is related to Sempronia by affinity, but only to Sempronia, and not to Caius the brother of Sempronia, and hence not to his son Cletus.

Under the old basis of the "copula carnalis" Laymann (5, 10, 4, 5) proposed the following rule. "When the man (to be married) has not had carnal relations with a blood relative of the woman he wishes to marry, and the woman has had no carnal relations with a blood relative of the man, there is no affinity between them which will prevent their marriage, but only an affinity of the second or third kind which has been abrogated." Modifying this to accord with the new legislation, it may be said that when the man to be married has not been validly married to a blood relative of the woman he wishes to marry, and vice versa, no impediment of affinity exists.

CONTROVERSY ABOUT THE LAST SUPPER.

Qu. Anent the controversy going on in the REVIEW, as to whether the Last Supper was a true and complete sacrifice or not, I am tempted to propose a difficulty, not for the purpose of entering the controversy, but to secure peace of mind.

From childhood we were taught that our Lord said the first Mass. We have taught the same to the children; and to recede from that position would create confusion.

It is certain that the Mass is the one true sacrifice of the New Law. As such it must have been instituted by Christ. If so, where and when was it instituted if not at the Last Supper?

The Apostles were commissioned as priests: "Do this" etc., which commission, as the chief function of the priestly office, was given them at the Last Supper. That priestly office is to offer sacrifice. Must it not follow that the Last Supper, as the function prescribed by Christ for His priests, was a true sacrifice?

An answer would resolve doubts raised by the discussion and would be gratefully received by

PRIESTLY TEACHER.

Resp. The doctrine that the Mass is a true sacrifice instituted by Christ, and to be continued in His Church by His validly ordained priests, is thoroughly sound Catholic teaching. But the elements which enter into the nature and completion of this sacrifice belong to the "mysterium fidei" and may lawfully become the topic of discussion among theologians. Père de la Taille, Bishop MacDonald, and others, favor what appeared to be a new explanation of the Mass as a sacrifice, in that its essential consummation must be sought in the act of Crucifixion and the death on Calvary. Fathers McNabb and Swaby, of the Dominican Order, like Father Brosnan, the Abbot Vonier, and the older school of teachers generally, maintain that there is a complete sacrificial element in the Supper as a sacramental expression of the Sacrifice of Calvary.

We published such opinions, on both sides, as seemed to us free from the personal and traditional *odium theologicum* of the schools. The zeal of the contestants may appear to some to have overstepped the limits of controversial courtesy in the effort to define theological doctrine and authoritative tradition. With the present number, in which Father Brosnan defends his views (in the volume on *The Sacrifice of the New*

Law) against misinterpretation caused by the emphasis which Bishop MacDonald laid on his interpretation in a critique which appeared as a book notice in our November issue, the controversy in the REVIEW may be closed. Any more definite summarizing must be left to the authority of the Church, whose decisions clear up such matters when it becomes necessary to avoid danger to our common faith.

LATIN MASS IN ORIENTAL CHURCH.

Qu. Caught in a snowdrift lately, I was obliged to stop near by in the house of an Oriental priest. As I wanted to say Mass I went into his chapel after finding that he had a small Roman Missal among his books. On the altar were the Ikons, but apparently there was no stone with reliquary on the mensa. As he spoke English I asked him about the altar and he explained to me that he used a corporal which, consecrated by the Greek bishop, contained at the angles relics sewn in. This he carried with him on missions, as a portable altar. I did not feel sure that it was a proper mensa for celebrating in the Latin rite and hence contented myself with receiving Communion at his Mass next morning, which was an anniversary for me. May Latin priests use the Greek rite?

Resp. Not without a special indult from the Holy See. Benedict XIV gave to the priests in Russian Poland such a faculty (Const. *Imposito nobis,* 29 March, 1751). Since then the new Code of Canon Law has (Can. 823, § 2) forbidden the celebration of Mass by Latin priests on the above-mentioned so-called *antimensia* of the Greek Church. Otherwise it is permissible to say Mass on the regularly consecrated altar in a church of different rite: "Deficiente altari proprii ritus sacerdoti fas est ritu proprio celebrare in altari consecrato alius ritus catholici, non autem super Graecorum antimensiis."

THE BISHOPS' PASTORAL LETTER ON THE MEXICAN SITUATION.

The Pastoral Letter of the American Hierarchy on the Mexican situation was published in all the dioceses of the United States and widely copied and commented on by the religious press. As it is desirable, however, to have it embodied in the REVIEW as a record for future reference, it will be reprinted in these pages at the end of the present volume (in June).

Criticisms and Notes

S. AURELI AUGUSTINI HIPPONIENSIS EPISCOPI DE CATECHIZANDIS RUDIBUS LIBER UNUS. Translated with an Introduction and Commentary. A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Letters of The Catholic University of America in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. By Joseph Patrick Christopher. Brookland, D. C.: The Catholic Education Press, 1926. Royal 8vo, paper binding, xxi + 365 pages.

It would not be hazardous to assert that the fine scholarship manifested by this volume parallels the fairly massive size of it, and gives it the notable distinction of superseding all previous editions of the *De Catechizandis Rudibus* alike in the adequacy of the translation and in the literary and linguistic apparatus supplied with loving zeal and learned competence.

The author had obviously two principal objects in mind. He wished to present English readers with a translation which should be at once correct and polished—no easy task, as a careful reading of his Commentary would sufficiently illustrate. His second principal object was to furnish a Commentary that should cover every grammatical, historical, pedagogical or devotional interest. He has succeeded admirably in achieving both objectives.

The concise but highly informative Introduction (13 pages) discusses the system of oral instruction in the primitive and early Church and notes that the Saint's treatise is the only one extant as a catechetical method for the *accedentes*; shows the occasion and the probable period of its composition, the contribution it has made to catechetics, its use by later writers, its historical and literary importance, its sources, style, and place in literature. The literary apparatus is abundant: a categorized Bibliography (9 pages); Additional Notes (12 pp.); a brief Appendix on African Latinity; four Indexes (Subjects, Scripture Texts, Latin Words and Phrases in the Commentary, and a General Index to Additional Notes and Appendix). Student and scholar alike will appreciate such painstaking editing.

We are first of all interested in the translation. One may wonder why, after not a few scholarly pens had already done the work of English renderings, it should have been thought proper to essay a new translation into English. It would be interesting to answer such a query at some length, but a reviewer's space is necessarily much limited. A few illustrations must suffice. First of all, then,

the very title of the Saint's treatise offers two difficulties in the way of an adequate English rendering. By "adequate" is meant not merely correct but informatively clear. What did St. Augustine mean by the word *catechizare*? What did he mean by *rudis*? Salmond renders the title as *The Catechizing of the Uninstructed*, and Barker includes this wording in his own longer title. No one will quarrel with the correctness of the word *catechizing*. But it is not informatively clear to the ordinary clerical reader of to-day, who naturally associates with the word *catechize* the pedagogical method of instructing by question and answer, since all kinds of catechisms have adopted this method. The reviewer recalls vividly his early boyish struggles over a certain "Catechism of American History", which was a question-and-answer book, its author evidently considering *catechism* to mean such a method. But that is not the method of St. Augustine's treatise. The editions of Cornish and Romestin translate the title: *On Instructing the Unlearned*. Now "instructing" is clearer than "catechizing" in relation to the Saint's method. What should be done with *rudis?* Cornish and Romestin render it as "unlearned". Unlearned in what? The Saint had in his purview scholarly and cultured folk as well as poorly educated inquirers. Salmond and Barker render the *rudis* by "uninstructed"—a better word than "unlearned", inasmuch as converts of all degrees of mentality or of education are said to "go under *instruction*" for admission to the Church. But all four translations face a difficulty in combining the preferable renderings into a single title. It would hardly do to render the title: "Instructing the Uninstructed," albeit *rudis* = uninstructed, and *catechizare* = to instruct. Dr. Christopher solves the difficulty: "On Instructing Candidates for the Catechumenate." This is precisely what the Saint implied by his own title. The first page of the Introduction will make the meaning of the title clear to any reader and exhibit its accuracy and adequacy.

In the second chapter, the Saint notes that the eagerness of his hearers indicates that his *eloquium* is not *frigidum* as he himself had thought. Salmond renders *frigidum* by "frigid". Christopher renders it by "dull", and places an interesting note in his Commentary (p. 137): "The use of this adjective in Latin and English aptly illustrates how, although two languages may have an image in common, they apply it differently", and gives English synonyms and a reference to Cicero by way of further illumination. There is a long and illuminating note (p. 179) on *idiota*, which has various meanings, indeed, but in the passage commented upon does not mean, as both Fausset and Barker suppose, a layman in the sense of one who is without technical knowledge of a subject, but simply an

illiterate, ignorant person. In its ecclesiastical meaning, *idiota* may indicate also one who is in a private capacity in the Church, whether learned or unlearned—a layman as distinguished from a cleric.

A brief but important note is given (p. 336) on a beautiful passage of Chapter 26, which touches a cardinal point in the Saint's theological outlook on predestination. Our author translates: "God in His mercy, desiring to deliver men from this destruction, that is, from everlasting punishment, if only they be not enemies to themselves [*si sibi ipsi non sint inimici*] and resist not the mercy of their Creator, sent His only-begotten Son, that is, His Word, equal to Himself, by which Word He created all things . . . ". Barker mistakenly translates "if they be not enemies to him [God] ", and Davis and Lock render the phrase by "if they be not His enemies ". Ernesti translates correctly, and the Note discusses the Latin construction.

The reviewer has unfortunately left himself but little space to illustrate the helpful character of the Commentary on many other points than that of mere translation. This Commentary, together with the Additional Notes, covers 215 pages (pp. 122-337). Its Notes refer (by Chapter and number) to the Latin text facing the English rendering. The whole arrangement makes consultation and comparison very easy for the reader. Especially interesting to the ordinary clerical reader will be the note on the probable origin of the question-and-answer method commonly associated with the idea of "catechism", covering two pages (309-311); the chiastic construction discussed in No. 12, page 292; No. 12, page 283; No. 4, page 245; No. 1, page 181; No. 31, pages 146-148; No. 24, page 139, a note over which the reviewer would love to linger, for the reason that it concludes with a stanza from "Hierusalem my happie home ", composed apparently by a secular priest, Francis Baker, who was for a time committed to the Tower of London. Of his hymn, Brooke declares that English hymnody has in its range "nothing fresher, clearer, tenderer ". The wide culture of Dr. Christopher is happily illustrated by this hymnal excerpt, wholly appropriate as it is to his discussion in the Note. Limitations of space press urgently now, and the reviewer feels guilty in having ventured upon instances—so few amongst many—of the interesting and enlightening character of the Commentary.

More than a word of praise should be bestowed upon the material make-up of the volume. The printing and proof-reading are excellent. The great variety in type (the Latin passages heading each Note being in bold Clarendon type, the Latin parallels in illustration being in italics, the Latin and English texts in roman) and the clearness of the impression combine to make each page, with its large margins and stout paper, a pleasure to read and to turn.

It would be a trite recommendation that "every priest should read" such a book. He undoubtedly would profit greatly by reading the Introduction, and even a few minutes a day employed in reading the book itself would result in a clearer apprehension of the Latinity of the Breviary. But he could also get excellent intimations and clear counsels from the treatise of the Saint—as fresh to-day in its principles as it was a millennium and a half ago—for an effective method of conveying instruction to prospective converts.

H. T. H.

LIFE, CHARACTER AND INFLUENCE OF DESIDERIUS ERASMUS OF ROTTERDAM. Derived from a Study of His Works and Correspondence. By John Joseph Mangan, A.M., M.D. Two volumes. New York: Macmillan Co. 1927. Pp. xv—403 and 407.

In the history of the religious revolt to which the name of Luther as the primary mover is given, no one single figure will serve the historian desirous of solving the problems involved in the life of the Church at that period so well as that of Desiderius Erasmus. Despite his prominence in the drama of the so-called Reformation it is not easy to get a true picture of that erratic genius. His face and figure have come to us in accurate delineation from the great painters of the day, but the portrayers of his mind and of the fitful moods in which he applied his great learning have been at variance ever since biographers began to write of him four hundred years ago.

On religious grounds he has been proclaimed as the originator of the Lutheran schism, hostile to Rome and its Catholic traditions. Yet numerous documents show him to have been the friend of saintly bishops like John Fisher and of statesmen like the Blessed Thomas More, men who died in defence of the Papacy and professing fidelity to its teaching. Erasmus was the man above all others who furnished Luther with a pretext for appealing to the Bible alone as the rule of faith and for rejecting the deutero-canonical books, yet in his letters he denounces the arrogance of the man who posed as the leader of a religious opposition to the Catholic Church. Among English historical writers who have made Erasmus the subject of special study during the last half-century, we have Drummond, Seebohm, Froude, Emmerton, Pennington, Capey, all of whom have sought to explain the apparent inconsistencies of the Erasmian writings, to which Hoffmann in his *Essai concernant la vie et les écrits d'Erasmus* had directed attention in 1866.

All this makes us eager to know what Dr. Mangan has to say in his two stately volumes on the subject. He gives us the key

toward forming an estimate of his work when he tells us that his study is wholly confined to the authentic historical data furnished by Erasmus's writings and the accounts of those with whom the latter came in direct contact. Our author thus avoids the attitude of a defender or of a critic. He sketches from life without any attempt either to emphasize or minimize the motives, methods and effects of the activity of the man whom he introduces to the student.

The correctness and truth of the account given by our author are vouched for by the sources from which he draws his information. These are not confined to the extensive bibliographical list at the end of the second volume but include consultation with men of letters, our foremost historical writers on the subject of the Reformation period and the guardians of the archives whence light is to be shed upon the persons involved in the historical drama. The libraries of Rome, Oxford, Leyden, Basle, and our Eastern universities have been consulted to secure unbiased statements of the facts drawn from documents.

As a result Dr. Mangan is able to present us with a finely drawn portrait which differs considerably from the traditional notions of the great humanist and Biblical scholar. The genius, brilliant, incisive, of an all-embracing culture, singularly eloquent, with a marvellous power of attraction in social and academic intercourse, is revealed to us in the guise of a small, delicately built, querulous, sensitive, and at times strangely timid man, wholly unprepossessing at first sight, yet capable of changing the bias of his hearers at the sound of his voice and the sincerity of his argumental manner.

His literary gifts show him the possessor of a mind of self-acquired education, covering every branch of classical erudition, and chiefly due to extraordinary powers of memory. He is a master of attractive interpretation through a ready wielding of the imagination, expressed in allegory, metaphor, and figurative allusion. On the other hand, there are evidences that this accumulated knowledge and handling of facts, while making him a capable critic, prevent his faculty of criticism from exercising the functions of a fair judge. His wisdom is not equal to his science. This defect is emphasized by a sensitiveness that turns his impressions toward an extreme egotism, a hastiness of conclusion and an irritability that mar his judgment of men and events. Of his sincerity there has been at no time any doubt among historians, although Luther and other opponents were accustomed to call him a hypocrite, a viper, and a brilliant talker without solid erudition and religion.

The reader feels that the defects which are plainly written in the actions and the writings of Erasmus are those of temper, of a finely critical yet hypersensitive disposition. A misguided early educa-

tion placed him in an environment that jarred upon his sense of justice and consistency, while it marred the high ideals represented and professed by the monastic and religious life. This led to his later dislike of, and at times hateful animosity against the monks and the institutions they defended. It developed a habit of bitter irony and sarcasm, which by his facility in speech and writing brought him in turn admiration and hatred. But as a teacher no less than as a man he was far superior to those whom he impatiently criticised or lashed by his keen wit and humor as the mood caught him. These facts are brought out by Dr. Mangan, who draws an admirable contrast between Luther and Erasmus which helps us more than psychical analysis to an understanding of the casual sympathy and the fundamental antipathy of these two men.

The result of this study of a conscientious and well informed historian and biographer is that we come to regard Erasmus as an extraordinary literary genius, intensely passionate and impressionable, thoroughly human in his varying moods, neurotic, vain, and often unjust in his judgments issued to friends or the public about men and conditions, especially where he fails to discriminate between doctrine and discipline. On the other hand, there is everywhere an underlying disposition to seek truth, to defend virtue, and to give due praise to what makes for order, harmony, beauty.

As he grows older he realizes more and more the worth of the Catholic faith, its doctrine and traditions, the vanity of earthly values and the need of sacramental aids to strengthen man on his pilgrimage toward heaven. With the approach of his end at the age of seventy, amidst increasing pains of sickness and the gradual weakening of his faculties which he was ever eager to use as a writer, there comes to the fore the mellowing influence of his religious convictions. These reveal him as a patient, generous friend and benefactor. He meets death with a reverent frame of mind befitting the priestly character which had been hidden under the zeal of the critic, the apologist, the polemical writer. We are glad to note that Dr. Mangan finds excellent reason for dissipating the current tradition that Erasmus died without the last Sacraments. There is every evidence that the companionship of his young secretary, the Belgian abbé, Lambert Coomans, who was constantly with him during the last two years, provided for his master those spiritual helps which his final acts and words showed him to value above earthly praise and gain. The friends who attended him at the last vouch for the truth of those edifying scenes described by Beatus Rhenanus and make us believe that Erasmus died a holy death which cancelled under God's mercy all the errors to which his position in life and hereditary limitations had given rise.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST. An Apologetic and Dogmatic Treatise. By E. Sylvester Berry, D.D., Professor of Apologetics in Mt. St. Mary's Seminary, Emmitsburg, Md. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo. 1927. Pp. xvii-566.

Knowing that of books dealing with the subject matter of this volume there already exists a goodly number, the reader may be apt to pass by unheeded a new accession to the list. Should he, however, follow this inclination in the present case he would make a mistake. For while it is true that we are not suffering from a famine in this line of doctrinal food, we have not got an oversupply of such all-round strengthening and gratifying provision as that which is offered us here. What commends the work most is its comprehensiveness. It is a relatively complete and fairly adequate study of the Church. That is, as the subtitle indicates, it combines in one treatise the apologetic and the expositional aspect of the subject. It treats in the first place of the origin of the Church as a visible social institution—namely that Christ *de facto* founded the Church; that He founded it alone and for a single ultimate purpose. In the second place it expounds the apologetic of the attributes, in the third the properties, and in the fourth the marks of the Church. These are the familiar lines of argument *pro Ecclesia Catholica*, and they delimit the apologetic portion (the lesser part) of the work. The second and the major part explains the dogmatic truths regarding the Church—the mystical body of Christ, its members, authority, its rulers, the primacy of Peter and his successors, the episcopate, infallibility, Church and State. These cover with relative fulness the dogmatic theology of the Church. Manifestly therefore the volume leaves no vital aspect of the subject unexplored. But what impresses the reader particularly is the manner in which the wealth of material is elaborated. The author has happily succeeded in combining the scholastic method of exposition with an agreeable style. Most of the material is cast in the didactic mold of theses, explained and proven by the traditional sources, with the objections stated and answered. In adopting this method, which undoubtedly makes for precision and solidity, the author has succeeded in avoiding the barbarisms of anglicized Latin that too often accompany the didactic apparatus and are apt to repel the educated reader.

A comprehensive treatise such as this is particularly timely. Next August there is to be held at Lausanne a convention representing most of the Christian denominations of the East and the West. The Catholic Church will not be represented; not because the Holy See was not invited or is not wanted, but simply because it declined to have part. The object of the meeting is to discuss the problems of

Church unification. A book has been issued under the auspices of the World's Conference on Faith and Order with the title *Can the Churches Unite?* (Century Co., N. Y., pp. 247). Leading Protestant divines in the United States and Canada contribute the papers that make up the volume. No thoughtful man, whatever be his religious convictions, can fail to applaud the motive that is urging our separated brethren to strive for a united Christendom and anyone who reads the volume just mentioned will rejoice to mark the fraternal sentiments and the tone of hopefulness that pervade its pages. On the other hand, no stronger evidence of the failure to which the Lausanne Convention is foredoomed can be found than that which is accumulated in these same pages. Almost without exception the writers seem wholly devoid of any consistent idea of what the Church founded by Christ really was and is.

Logically the lack of that idea may be traced to the absence of a true conception of the Divine Personality of Christ. The conviction that Christ was and is really God, and that He established as a medium of human salvation one Church which He determined should endure unerring and spotless unto the end of the world—this conviction is absent from the papers in question, with one exception. Father Scott contributes a paper in which with his invincible logic and straightforward virile style he shows that the Catholic Church alone possesses the unfailing principle of unity, since she alone possesses Divine origin, is vitalized and guided by one informing Spirit, and is the bearer throughout time of Christ's promises of indefectibility and infallibility.

If the representatives of the Protestant denominations who are to meet in Lausanne would make an unbiased and a prayerful study of such a treatise as *The Church of Christ*, the answer to the title question of the *Symposium* mentioned above might be more hopefully affirmative. On the other hand, however, the condition is less likely of fulfilment than the conditionate. *Sperandum autem.*

DE SPONSALIBUS ET MATRIMONIO. Tractatus Theologico-Canonicus (Theologia Brugensis). Auctore Al. de Smet, S.T.D. Editio quarta (inde a Codice altera)—Carolo Beyeart: Brugis. 1927. Pp. xlv-840.

Probably the most difficult of all the tracts which the student of Moral Theology (especially in the United States) has to master in dealing with pastoral problems is that *De Matrimonio.* The new Canon Law has had to test the constantly varying conditions of social, as well as domestic life, and the immigration from Europe brings with it difficulties which can hardly have been foreseen by

the expert moralist. Our pastoral clergy must rely in most difficulties of a practical nature which arise from these conditions on the decisions of the episcopal chancery or curia. But in America distances and personal conditions make intercommunication often difficult if not impossible. Here the priest has to act on his own knowledge and sound principles learnt in the seminary. The REVIEW is constantly appealed to in similar circumstances; but the conditions on which the validity of a marriage depends frequently demand minute inquiry which cannot be explained or communicated by letter. Yet the matter is one of serious consequences to the parties concerned. Under these circumstances it is of great importance to have a manual of reference on which one may rely and which will guide the student or the pastor or chancery official in making the necessary inquiries and a safe decision.

On former occasions we have directed attention to the exceptional value of Doctor de Smet's work in this field. The author has made himself familiar with every phase of the difficulties and written separately in former publications for students in the seminary, for priests on the mission in Latin, and for the laity in the vernacular (French and Dutch). The present volume needs therefore no other commendation than to say that it covers the last decisions of the Sacred Congregations interpreting the canons as revised since 1918. Professors of Moral Theology will find it a safe text toward a helpful analysis that will guide the student about to enter on the pastoral mission. The author retains the methods of his former editions, but the references to canons defining legislation, and to decisions which serve as interpretation are of renewed value. The manual refers frequently to the *Statuta Brugensia*, but this does not hinder a clear view of the application in general.

Literary Chat

The Church and the Republic is a well-made volume comprising a course of six lectures which its author, Fr. John A. McClorey, S.J., delivered in Detroit and Chicago during the Lent of 1926. There are six lectures in all. The first on *Our Republic* unfolds a timely protest against the growing movement to change the *Constitution* and thus change the Republic into an essentially different thing from the design of its founders. The concluding lecture, pointing out the relations between Church and State, proves the concrete impossibility of the Catholic Church being anything but friendly to the Republic. Of the intermediate four lectures, two deal with the problems of Divorce and two with the menace of Birth Control. There are no subjects of more fundamental or far-reaching importance than these, none upon which the truths of the Catholic faith and philosophy more need to be focused. This is what Fr. McClorey does in these lectures, and

he does it in a clear and straightforward style. (Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo.; pp. 180.)

Apropos of one of the principal topics discussed in the foregoing book, mention should be made of a small volume entitled *The Church and Divorce* by Dr. Thomas Mahon, Professor in Summer Hill College, Ireland (Herder Book Co.). Within the space of some seventy pages the author summarizes and analyzes in the first place the teaching of the Sacred Scriptures on the indissolubility of marriage, and in the second place the testimony of tradition on the same subject, beginning with Constantine and traversing both Greek and Latin practice down to the Council of Trent. The book should be useful to laymen, especially lawyers and lawmakers, as it makes plain the one and only reason why divorce is not permitted to Catholics, *that Christ has emphatically prohibited divorce* (p. 12). The author makes good this conclusion by a close critique of the Gospel texts, especially the greatly vexed passages from St. Matthew.

Father A. M. Skelly, O.P., the author of a well-known series of *Doctrinal Discourses* (5 vols.), has recently published through the Herder Book Co. *Retreat Conferences for Religious Sisterhoods* (pp. 233). Priests who have occasion to instruct nuns or direct their spiritual exercises will find Fr. Skelly's *Conferences* helpful. They cover the main lines of the average annual retreat, and are both concise in expression and comprehensive in range. Probably in order to secure the former quality the author employs no anecdotes, contenting himself with an occasional Biblical illustration. Retreat directors therefore who use the book will have to look elsewhere for those helps to hold the attention of their auditors. The book can be warmly recommended to religious women as collateral reading in their various retreats, monthly or annual.

Among the genuinely instructive books which help the pastor and teacher of morals to interpret the problems of life in the search after human happiness, are Father Owen Dudley's modest volumes entitled *The Shadow on the Earth* and the previously published *Will Men be Like Gods?*, to which latter Mr. G. K. Chesterton has added an interesting preface. These books answer the doubts we may feel about the quality of success in life and about the darkness that comes to the sense amid suffering. They clear up the sky of soul-life and give confidence that leads to joy. We welcome the promise of more from the same source. (Longmans, Green and Co.: New York, London, Toronto, Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras.)

To the invalid or the man who seeks relief from laborious duties *The Adventurer's Club* by Gerald Paulet (Skeffington and Son, London), *Dad's Musings* by P. J. Donovan (J. H. Meier, Chicago), and *Ould Father Toomey* by Dennis A. McCarthy, offer thoughtful yet also humorous reading matter. The first is a romantic discourse about art, letters, and the impressions produced by adventurers in the field of beauty and wisdom. Father Donovan's book puts wholesome suggestions and advice derived from daily experiences with all classes of people at home and abroad into the form of pleasant talks with the members of Dad's family. Of "Ould Father Toomey" we have spoken in these pages before; but as the average cleric has limited admiration for mere poetry we want to emphasize the practical value of Mr. McCarthy's verses.

The subject of instructions and prayer books for those who are about to enter marriage or who have been joined in wedlock was recently discussed in the REVIEW, as often before during the thirty-eight years of its appeal to the pastoral clergy. *Plain Talks on Marriage* by Fr. Fulgence Meyer, O.F.M., is a neatly published volume issued by St. Francis Book Shop (Cincinnati) which serves the twofold purpose of instruction in preparation for marriage ceremony by the pastor, and as a convenient gift to remind the candidates and the newly married folk of their graces and obligations.

Teachers of music and musical artists will be much helped by *Music*

Appreciation in the School-Room, edited with the coöperation of leading directors of School Music throughout the country by Elbridge W. Newton. It not merely defines and explains the functions of musical instruction but shows the correlation of that echo of wisdom with other subjects of scholastic training, such as drawing, geography, history (biography), and English literature. To the cleric musical education is an essential factor for the proper exercise of religion in worship, in the development of character and in the power of influencing the will to bring about that harmony which is the safeguard of order and peace. The publishers have made this volume particularly attractive to grace its useful feature as part of any school or private library. (Ginn and Co.: Boston, New York, Chicago, London.)

A writer with the significant name of Dr. Karl Sonnenschein is making a successful propaganda for popular devotion after the model of St. Francis of Assisi. His style of writing is wholly unlike that of the academic Teuton, although he evinces respect for what is called modern culture and the practical aspects of daily life which differ from the national and traditional methods of the Umbrian people. In brief, abrupt sentences he pictures the life of the Saint and thence draws the principles of contentment and true success which mark the call of St. Francis. This he contrasts with the feverish quest after wealth, the futile efforts of enjoyment which characterize the modern aim at restoration of order in the world since the war. By bringing into the midst of the great metropolis a tramp animated by the spirit of the Umbrian Saint, serving ready to spend the gains of his labor to relieve distress, and to make God seen in His creatures, the writer revives an ideal lost to a great extent in our modern life as it was lost and revived in the days of Bernardone of Assisi. It is what we need everywhere. Among our laymen there are those ready to labor for such propaganda. Let priestly leaders direct and encourage the efforts where they appear and appeal to the shepherds of souls. (Deutsche Zukunft: Koeln, 3. Febr. 1927.)

Admirable work is being done for truth by Fr. Peter M. Dunne, S.J., through the *Historical Bulletin*. He wages war against the habit of historians (not the anti-Catholic maligners of the Church and her priesthood) who, under the guise of Catholic apologists, suppress historical facts or seek to explain them away because they reflect upon individuals and institutions bearing the name or label of the Church. They are writers who, to use the words of the late biographer of St. Ignatius Loyola, Paul Van Dyke, seek to edify at the expense of frankness. These do not serve but injure the cause of Catholic apologetics.

The habit of defending everything done or said by churchmen who pose as authorities has become a disease in Church circles, especially of America. With regard to the so-called Reformation period it is partly recognized that the defections and errors provoking an appeal to the Bible as supreme arbiter of truth and right morals were caused largely by the neglect of priests and bishops of the day to preach and observe the divine Law. The Church corrected the errors in the Council but she had to pay toll by the martyrdom of her children and by the sacrifices of renewed religious perfection through the establishment of ascetical schools. The same is true to-day of the Mexican situation. The faithful with their priests and bishops are now suffering from neglect of their elders in generations past. No amount of whitewashing will undo the facts read by the unprejudiced student of history. We need truth and not merely the advertising or label of it in Catholic life.

One way to increase faithful and devout attendance at the liturgical services of the Church is to introduce the devotion of *The Holy Hour*. The periodical Mission given in the parish offers opportunities for explaining and ordering the devotion. The distribution of a little booklet containing suitable prayers and suggesting a way to assist at the Holy Hour will help to preserve the zeal and love thus kindled for Jesus in the Tabernacle. Father C. E. Dowd has prepared an excellent collection of indulgenced prayers to this end. (E. M. Lohmann Co., St. Paul, Minn.)

Books Received

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST. An Apologetic and Dogmatic Treatise. By Sylvester Berry, D.D., Prof. Mt. St. Mary's Seminary, Emmitsburg. B. Herder Book Co.: St. Louis, Mo., and London. Pp. 565. Price, $3.00.

HIS MOTHER. The Life History of Mary, the Mother of Christ. By Alice W. Darton. Macmillan Co., New York. 1927. Pp. 275. Price, $2.25.

HEALING THE BODY THROUGH THE HOLY EUCHARIST. By the Rev. John G. Haas, 110 Shonnard Place, Yonkers, N. Y. Pp. 50. Price, $0.50.

PLAIN TALKS ON MARRIAGE. By the Rev. Fulgence Meyer, O.F.M., Missionary, author of *Uni Una—To the One God My One Soul, Jesus and His Pets, The Seraphic Highway, Forty Hours.* St. Francis Book Shop, Cincinnati. 1927. Pp. 184.

DE SPONSALIBUS ET MATRIMONIO. Tractatus Theologico-Canonicus. Al. De Smet, S.T.D. Editio quarta (Inde a Codice altera). (*Theologia Brugensis.*) Car. Beyaert, Brugis. 1927. Pp. xlv—840. Pretium, 22 *Belgas;* linteo, 23.80 *Belgas;* a dorso corio, 27.50 *Belgas.*

CONVERSATIONS ON VOCATIONS. By F. J. Remler, C.M., author of *Supernatural Merit; Laying Up Treasure in Heaven; The Eternal Inheritance; Why Must I Suffer?* Vincentian Press, 1605 Locust St., St. Louis. 1926. Pp. iv—160. Price, $0.35.

THE SIX STATES OF MAN. A Chart in Five Colors. By F. J. Remler, C.M. Vincentian Press, St. Louis. 1926. Size 16½ by 27 inches. Price, $0.20.

THE HUMAN RACE IN RELATION TO SALVATION THROUGH THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. A Chart in Five Colors. By F. J. Remler, C.M. Vincentian Press, St. Louis. 1926. Size 16½ by 27 inches. Price, $0.20.

EXERZITIENBUCH DES HL. IGNATIUS VON LOYOLA. Erklärt von Moritz Meschler, S.J. Herausgegeben von Walter Sterp, S.J. III Theil, n. 2. B. Herder Book Co., Freiburg, Brisg., St. Louis und London. Seiten 486. Preis, $2.25.

GEMEINSCHAFTSGEDANKE IM VATERUNSER. Von Anton Worlitscheck, München. B. Herder Book Co., Freiburg, Brisg., St. Louis und London. 1927. Seiten 97. Preis, $0.70.

ACTES DE BENOIT XV. Encycliques, Motu Proprio, Brefs, Allocutions, Actes des Dicastères, etc. Texte latin avec traduction française. Tome III: Octobre 1920-1921. Maison de la Bonne Presse, Paris 8e. 1926. Pp. 250. Prix, 4 *fr.* 85 *franco.*

LES EGLISES ORIENTALES ET LES RITES ORIENTAUX. Par Raymond Janin, des Augustins de l'Assomption. Deuxième édition revue et corrigée avec 58 illustrations et 8 cartes. Maison de la Bonne Presse, Paris 8e. 1926. Pp. xii—655. Prix, 16 *fr.* 25 *franco.*

L'ÉDUCATION RELIGIEUSE DE L'ENFANT. Par J. Burret. Préface de Mgr. Lavallée, recteur des Facultés Catholiques de Lyon. Maison de la Bonne Presse, Paris 8e. 1926. Pp. xi—188. Prix, 6 *fr.* 65 *franco.*

RETREAT CONFERENCES FOR RELIGIOUS SISTERHOODS. By the Rev. A. M. Skelly, O.P. B. Herder Book Co.: St. Louis, Mo., and London. Pp. 223. Price, $1.75.

PHILOSOPHICAL.

THE REPUBLIC AND THE CHURCH. A Series of Lenten Lectures, mainly on Divorce and Birth Control. By the Rev. John A. McClorey, S.J., of the University of Detroit. B. Herder Book Co.: St. Louis, Mo., and London. Pp. 172. Price, $1.50.

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS. Do We Need Religious Education? By the Rev. Michael J. Larkin, LL.D., Superintendent of Catholic Schools in Westchester County, N. Y. (*Paulist Educational Series.*) Paulist Press, 401 West 59th Street, New York. 1927. Pp. 32. Price, $0.05.

LA LUTTE CATHOLIQUE. Sixième Conférence: *La Question de l'École unique.* Septième Conférence: *La Malfaisance de l'École unique.* Par Jean Cœur. (*Bibliothèque des Conférences,* Série C, No. 6 et No. 7.) Maison de la Bonne Presse, Paris 8e. 1926. Prix: chaque Conférence, 32 pages compactes, 1 *fr.* 65 *franco.*

LES ÉTAPES DE DÉHIVAL DANS LES VOIES DE L'AMOUR. Par Henri Bontoux. Deuxième édition revue et augmentée. Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris. 1926. Pp. viii—638. Prix, 16 *frs.*

LITURGICAL.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL YEAR. Contemplations on the Deeper Meaning and Relation of Its Seasons and Fasts. By John Rickaby, S.J. With an Introduction by John C. Reville, S.J., Ph.D. Joseph F. Wagner, New York. Pp. 326.

ORDRE DES OFFICES DE LA SEMAINE SAINTE À JÉRUSALEM du IVe au Xe Siècle. Études de Liturgie et de Topographie Palestiniennes. Par le R. P. J.-B. Thibaut, des Augustins de l'Assomption. Maison de la Bonne Presse, Paris 8e. 1926. Pp. 128. Prix, 5 *fr.* 45 *franco.*

HISTORICAL.

LIFE, CHARACTER AND INFLUENCE OF DESIDERIUS ERASMUS OF ROTTERDAM. Derived from a Study of His Works and Correspondence. By John Joseph Mangan, A.M., M.D. Two volumes. Macmillan Co., New York. 1927. Pp. xvii—404 and vii—427. Price per set, $10.00.

THE WHITE FRIARS. An Outline Carmelite History. With Special Reference to the English-speaking Provinces. By the Rev. P. R. McCaffrey, Ord. Carm. (of the Irish Province). With a Foreword by the Most Rev. P. E. Magennis, Ord. Carm., Prior-General. With illustrations and maps. M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd., Dublin. 1926. Pp. xx—507. Price, 15/- *net.*

LANGUAGE STUDIES IN THE FRANCISCAN ORDER. A Historical Sketch. By John M. Lenhart, O.M.Cap. (*Franciscan Studies,* No. 5.) Joseph F. Wagner, New York. 1926. Pp. 104.

POPES AND CARDINALS IN MODERN ROME. By Carlo Prati. Translated by E. I. Watkin. With an Introduction by Jean Carrere. Lincoln MacVeagh, the Dial Press, 152 West 13th Street, New York. 1927. Pp. 234. Price, $3.50.

LES DEUX FRÈRES. Cinquante années de l'Action Catholique dans le Nord: Philibert Vrau (1829-1905); Camille Feron-Vrau (1831-1908). Par Mgr. Baunard. Maison de la Bonne Presse ou J. De Gigord, Paris. 1910. Pp. xxi—640. Prix, 15 *fr.* 85 *franco.*

MISCELLANEOUS.

SCHOOL BOOKS: *Our Environment.* How We Use and Control It. By George C. Wood and Harry A. Carpenter. Edited by James M. Glass. Pp. xxviii—736. Price, $1.80. *First Latin.* With Collateral Reading. By Victor E. François. Book One. Pp. xxvi — 523. Price, $1.40. *Business Law.* With Illustrative Cases and Problems. By Samuel P. Weaver, A.M., LL.B. Assisted by Nellie M. Catton and John W. Lindley. Pp. xiv—437. *Grammar at Work.* By Jessie L. Wheeler. Pp. xiii—286. Price, $1.00. *One-Act Plays.* Compiled and edited by George A. Goldstone. Pp. vi—408. Price, $1.00. *Pierre.* Souvenirs de Jeunesse par Anatole France. Selected and edited by Anna Adèle Chenot and Louise Bourgoin. Pp. xxviii—254. Price, $0.80. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta, San Francisco, Dallas.